

DE GRUYTER

Marek Winiarczyk

THE ›SACRED HISTORY‹ OF EUHEMERUS OF MESSENE

BEITRÄGE ZUR ALTERTUMSKUNDE

Marek Winiarczyk
The *Sacred History* of Euhemerus of Messene

Beiträge zur Altertumskunde

Herausgegeben von
Michael Erler, Dorothee Gall,
Ludwig Koenen, Clemens Zintzen

Band 312

De Gruyter

Marek Winiarczyk

The *Sacred History*
of Euhemerus of Messene

Translated from Polish by
Witold Zbirohowski-Kościa

De Gruyter

ISBN 978-3-11-027888-0
e-ISBN 978-3-11-029488-0
ISSN 1616-0452

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

A CIP catalogue record for this book has been applied for at the Library of Congress.

Bibliografische Information der Deutschen Nationalbibliothek

Die Deutsche Nationalbibliothek verzeichnet diese Publikation in der Deutschen
Nationalbibliografie; detaillierte bibliografische Daten sind im Internet
über <http://dnb.dnb.de> abrufbar.

© 2013 Walter de Gruyter GmbH, Berlin/Boston

Druck: Hubert & Co. GmbH und Co. KG, Göttingen
∞ Gedruckt auf säurefreiem Papier

Printed in Germany

www.degruyter.com

Alexandrae uxori carissimae
Mulieris bonae beatus vir
(Ecclesiasticus 26, 1)

Preface

In 1991 I published Euhemerus' testimonies with commentary in the *Bibliotheca Scriptorum Graecorum et Romanorum Teubneriana*.¹ This became the basis for my further studies regarding Euhemerus. Other scholars have also frequently made use of my edition. I next wrote several articles on the life of Euhemerus and various aspects of his work, the *Ἱερὰ Ἀναγραφὴ* (the *Sacred History*), which appeared in the journals *Antiquitas*, *Eos*, *Rheinisches Museum* and *Wiener Studien*. My research also led to the publication of the monograph *Euhemerus von Messene. Leben, Werk und Nachwirkung*, München-Leipzig, 2002 (Beiträge zur Altertumskunde 157). This was met with considerable interest among scholars, as is evidenced by seven positive reviews.² Even if the reviewers sometimes had different opinions with regard to details (which is understandable, since only fragments of Euhemerus' work have survived), they stressed the high academic standard of my book and stated that it forms the basis of future studies regarding Euhemerus and euhemerism.³ The monograph has become part of scholarly literature and is frequently cited.

- 1 *Euhemerus Messenius, Reliquiae*, ed. M. Winiarczyk, Stuttgart-Lipsiae 1991. See reviews: 'Arctos' 25, 1991, 201–202 (J. Aronen); BAGB 1992, 423 (E. Des Places); 'Helmantica' 43, 1992, 437 (R.M. Herrera); 'Kernos' 5, 1992, 351 (B. Rochette); 'Scriptorium' 46, 1992, 18^x – 19^x (M. Mund-Dopchie); A&R 38, 1993, 150–151 (F. Bornmann).
- 2 'Bryn Mawr Classical Review' 1.8.2002 (P. van der Horst); 'Humanities. H.-Soz-u-Kult' 26, August 2002 (Ch. Schubert), CR 53, 2003, 309–311 (B. Garstad); 'Polifemo' 3, 2003, 193–194 (F. Mora); 'Gnomon' 76, 2004, 237–240 (R. Baumgarten); 'Phronesis' 49, 2004, 215–216 (K. Algra); 'Revue de Philologie' 78, 2004, 368–370 (F. Létoublon).
- 3 See van der Horst, *op. cit.* 'There can be no doubt that the book reviewed here is now, and will be for the decades to come, the most authoritative monograph on Euhemerus ... He really offers everything one needs to pursue further study of E.'; Garstad, *op. cit.*, 311 'W. has laid the groundwork for all future study of Euhemerus. ... His presentation of the views of other scholars is thorough and fair. On the whole, his book is a comprehensive guide to the research on an intriguing subject.'; Mora, *op. cit.*, 194 'quest'opera destinata a rimanere un importante punto di riferimento per la ricerca su Evemero'; Létoublon, *op. cit.*, 170 'L'ouvrage est clair, sérieux, comportant tout l'appareil scientifique souhaitable, et la présentation conforme aux principes de la collection'; Baumgarten, *op. cit.*, 240 'Die Stärken liegen eindeutig in der erschöpfenden Auswertung auch entlegener Sekundärliteratur und in der übersichtlichen und klaren Anordnung des Stoffes ... Es besitzt dadurch den Charakter eines kritischen Forschungsberichts ... zu dem jeder gerne greifen wird,

After 2000, I continued my research into ancient utopias. First I published an article on the definition and classification of utopias, presenting their ancient history and historiography. Next I published several studies of so-called Hellenistic utopias: Uranopolis, which was founded by Alexarchus on the Athos peninsula; the land of the Meropes as presented by Theopompus of Chios in his *Φιλippικά*; the Hyperborean island Helixoia as described by Hecataeus of Abdera and the land of Musicanus presented by Onesicritus of Astypalaea in his book on *How Alexander was Educated*. These helped me better understand Euhemerus' work and its place in Hellenistic utopian literature. Recently I published *Die hellenistischen Utopien*, Berlin-Boston, 2011 (Beiträge zur Altertumskunde 293), a book which is a summary of my years of studies regarding Hellenistic utopias.⁴

In the years 2000–2009 several articles appeared regarding various aspects of Euhemerus' work. Particularly deserving of attention were those published by Jan Dochhorn (2000–2002), who had not yet read my monograph, Benjamin Garstad (2004), Franco De Angelis and B. Garstad (2006) and Sylvia Honigman (2009). However, I have to admit that I cannot agree with all the views in these articles and some I even deeply object to, as I shall explain in this book. That is why I have decided to publish an extended version of my monograph, which was originally published in German. I hope this book will be of interest not only to scholars of ancient history and classical philology but also those studying religions, the history of philosophy and ancient utopias.

Wrocław, October 2012

Marek Winiarczyk

der gründlich und zuverlässig über die Thematik informiert und auf die Forschungsprobleme aufmerksam gemacht werden möchte.'

4 See B. Kytzler, 'Bryn Mawr Classical Review', 15.06.2012.

Contents

Abbreviations	XIII
I. The life of Euhemerus	1
1. Dating Euhemerus	1
2. Place of birth	5
3. Place of activity	7
4. Euhemerus in ancient tradition	8
A. Geographer	8
B. Historian	9
C. Atheist Philosopher	9
D. Poet	10
II. Euhemerus' Ἱερὰ Ἀναγραφή	13
1. The state of preservation of the work	13
2. Interpretation of the title	14
3. When the work was written	15
4. Literary form	16
A. Ideal island	16
B. <i>Locus amoenus</i>	18
C. Utopian novel	19
5. Applied method	21
III. The theological views of Euhemerus of Messene	27
1. The reliability of Diodorus' account of the <i>theologia dipertita</i> in Euhemerus' Ἱερὰ Ἀναγραφή	27
2. Sources regarding Euhemerus' theological views	28
A. Old Greek concepts	29
a. The hero cult	29
b. Gods as the founders of cults	32
c. The tombs of the gods	33
B. Euergetism	41
C. Rationalistic interpretation of myths	46
D. The Sophistic movement	47
E. The origins of the commander and ruler cult in the 5 th and 4 th centuries BC	48

a. Lysander, Spartan commander (d. 395 r.)	48
b. Dionysius I, tyrant of Syracuse (405–367)	50
c. Dion of Syracuse	51
d. Clearchus, tyrant of Heraclea Pontica (364/363–353/ 352)	51
e. Nicagoras, tyrant of Zeleia (to 334)	52
f. Philip II, king of Macedonia (359–336)	53
g. Alexander III the Great (336–323)	56
h. Summary	58
F. The ruler cult at the start of the Hellenistic period (up to 270)	59
a. The Antigonids	59
b. The Lagids	60
c. The Seleucids	63
d. Summary	63
G. Hecataeus of Abdera	64
H. Leon of Pella	66
I. Summary	68
IV. Society and economy in the Ἱερὰ Ἀναγραφὴ	71
1. The island of Hieria	71
2. The island of Panchaea	72
3. Why Hieria should not be identified as Panchaea	79
4. The ‘sources’ of the socio-economic description	81
5. Summary	86
V. The Zeus Sanctuary on the Island of Panchaea	87
1. The temple and temenos	87
2. The stele in the temple	90
A. The account on the stele	90
B. Ἱερὸς λόγος on the stele	93
3. The priests of Zeus Triphylus	96
4. Summary	97
VI. An attempt to interpret the Ἱερὰ Ἀναγραφὴ	99
1. Destruction of belief in the Olympian gods	99
2. Satire on the ruler cult	100
3. A justification or promotion of the ruler cult	101
4. A description of an ideal state system	103
5. An explanation of the origins of belief in gods	104
6. Promoting the idea of unity and brotherhood of all people . .	105
7. Reinterpretation of Greek mythology	106
8. Summary	108

VII. Ennius' <i>Euhemerus sive sacra historia</i>	109
1. The history of its genesis	109
A. Scipio Africanus	110
B. Ennius' <i>Scipio</i>	112
C. Dating Ennius' <i>Euhemerus</i>	114
2. The translation title	114
3. The translation form	115
4. A close translation or free version?	118
5. Ennius' translation in the works of Latin authors	119
6. Summary	122
VIII. Euhemerism in the ancient world	123
1. Pagan literature	123
A. Euhemerus and Euhemerism	123
B. Euhemerism and the ruler cult	124
C. Euhemerism in mythological novels	125
a. Dionysius Scytobrachion	125
b. Dinarchus of Delos	128
c. The 'Phrygian Literature'	128
D. Stoic Euhemerism	129
E. Euhemerism in historiography	131
a. Leon of Pella	131
b. Mnaseas of Patara in Lycia	132
c. Nicagoras of Cyprus	132
d. Polybius	133
e. Apollodorus of Athens	134
f. Castor of Rhodes	134
g. Diodorus Siculus	134
h. Thallus	136
i. Philo of Byblos	137
j. Sisyphus of Cos	140
F. Latin Euhemerists	140
G. <i>Index deorum cognominum</i>	142
H. Pseudo-Euhemerists	144
a. Diagoras of Melos	144
b. Palaephatus	145
c. Megasthenes	145
d. Philochorus of Athens	146
e. <i>Res gestae Divi Augusti</i>	146
f. Lucian of Samosata	147
2. Patristic literature	148
A. Rejection of Euhemerism	148

B. Acceptance of Euhemerism	149
C. Summary and medieval Euhemerism	152
3. Jewish literature	154
A. Eupolemus	154
B. Pseudo-Eupolemus	155
C. Artapanus	156
D. Theodotus	156
E. The <i>Sibylline Oracles</i>	156
F. Summary	158
IX. Conclusions	161
Appendix I: Homines pro diis culti	167
Appendix II: Deos homines fuisse	171
Appendix III: The tombs of the gods	177
Bibliography	183
1. Editions	183
A. Editions of fragments from Euhemerus' work	183
a. Greek and Latin testimonia	183
b. Latin testimonia	183
B. Editions of authors cited in this book	184
2. Secondary works	197
Indexes	247
1. Indexes of names	247
2. Index of geographical and ethnic names	252
3. Index of subjects	255
4. Greek and Latin words and expressions	258
A. Greek words and expressions	258
B. Latin expressions	259
5. Index of passages	259

Abbreviations

AA	Archäologischer Anzeiger
AAAH	Acta Antiqua Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae
AC	L'Antiquité Classique
AHB	Ancient History Bulletin
AION	Annali dell'Istituto Universitario Orientale di Napoli
AJA	American Journal of Archaeology
AJAH	American Journal of Ancient History
AJPh	American Journal of Philology
AncSoc	Ancient Society
A & R	Atene e Roma
AJA	American Journal of Archaeology
ANRW	Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt. Geschichte und Kultur Roms im Spiegel der neueren Forschung, hrsg. von H. Temporini, W. Haase, Berlin – New York 1972 ff.
APF	Archiv für Papyrusforschung
ARW	Archiv für Religionswissenschaft
ASNP	Annali della Scuola Normale Superiore di Pisa
BAB	L'Académie Royale de Belgique. Bulletin de la Classe des Lettres et de Science Morales et Politiques
BAC	Bochumer Altertumswissenschaftliches Colloquium
BAGB	Bulletin de l'Association de G. Budé
BCH	Bulletin de Correspondance Hellénique
BEFAR	Bibliothèque des Écoles Françaises d'Athènes et de Rome
BICS	Bulletin of the Institute of Classical Studies, London
BJRL	Bulletin of the John Rylands Library
BPhW	Berliner Philologische Wochenschrift
BSA	British School at Athens
BSG	Berichte über die Verhandlungen der Königlichen Sächsischen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften
CAG	Commentaria in Aristotelem Graeca, 1–23, Berolini 1882–1907.
CAH	Cambridge Ancient History. Second Edition, Cambridge 1970 ff.
CC Cont. Med.	Corpus Christianorum. Continuatio Medievalis, Turnholti 1971 ff.
CCL	Corpus Christianorum. Series Latina, Turnholti 1954 ff.
C & M	Classica et Mediaevalia
CFHB	Corpus Fontium Historiae Byzantinae, Berlin 1967 ff.
CISA	Contributi dell'Istituto di Storia Antica, Università Cattolica di Milano
CJ	Classical Journal
ClAnt	Classical Antiquity
CMG	Corpus Medicorum Graecorum, Lipsiae – Berolini 1908 ff.
CPG	Corpus Pseudoepigrapharum Graecorum, edd. E.L. Leutsch – F.W. Schneidewin, vol. I-II, Göttingae 1839–1851 (przedruk Hildesheim 1958).
CPh	Classical Philology
CQ	Classical Quarterly
CR	Classical Review

CrErc	Cronache Ercolanesi
CSCA	California Studies in Classical Antiquity
CSEL	Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum, Vindobonae 1866 ff.
CSHB	Corpus Scriptorum Historiae Byzantinae, 1–50, Bonnae 1828–1878.
CW	Classical Weekly
DK	Die Fragmente der Vorsokratiker, hrsg. von H. Diels, W. Kranz, 1–2, Berlin 1951–1952 (reprint Hildesheim 1996).
DLZ	Deutsche Literaturzeitung
DNP	Der Neue Pauly. Enzyklopädie der Antike. Hrsg. von H. Cancik, H. Schneider, 1–12, Stuttgart – Weimar 1996–2002.
DPhA	Dictionnaire des Philosophes Antiques, publié sous la direction de R. Goulet, Paris 1994 ff.
EA	Epigraphica Anatolica
EMC/CV	Echos du Monde Classique/Classical Views
EPRO	Études Préliminaires aux Religions dans l'Empire Romaine, Leiden 1961–1992.
ERE	Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics, ed. by J. Hastings, 1–13, Edinburgh 1908–1926.
FGrHist	Die Fragmente der griechischen Historiker, hrsg. von F. Jacoby, 1–3, Berlin – Leiden 1923–1958 (reprint Leiden 1967–1996).
FHG	Fragmenta Historicorum Graecorum, ed. C. Müller, 1–5, Paris 1841–1870.
GB	Grazer Beiträge
GCS	Die griechischen christlichen Schriftsteller der ersten (drei) Jahrhunderte, (Leipzig-) Berlin 1897 ff.
G & R	Greece and Rome
GGM	Geographi Graeci Minores, 1–2, ed. C. Müller, Parisiis 1855–1861 (reprint Hildesheim 1965 and 1990).
GHI	A Selection of Greek Historical Inscriptions, ed. by M.N. Tod, vol. I–II, Oxford 1946–1948.
GRBS	Greek Roman and Byzantine Studies
GRF	Grammaticae Romanae Fragmenta, ed. H. Funaioli, Lipsiae 1907.
HdA	Handbuch der Altertumswissenschaft
HGL	Handbuch der griechischen Literatur der Antike
HLL	Handbuch der lateinischen Literatur der Antike
HRR	Historicorum Romanorum Reliquiae, ed. H. Peter, vol. I, Lipsiae 1914, vol. II, Lipsiae 1906 (reprint Stuttgartiae-Lipsiae 1993).
HSCPh	Harvard Studies in Classical Philology
HThR	Harvard Theological Review
HZ	Historische Zeitschrift
ICS	Illinois Classical Studies
IG	Inscriptiones Graecae, Berolini 1873 ff.
JAW	Jahresbericht über die Fortschritte der Altertumswissenschaft (=Bursians Jahresbericht)
JbAC	Jahrbuch für Antike und Christentum
JbbKIPhil	Jahrbücher für Klassische Philologie
JDAI	Jahrbuch des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts
JEA	Journal of Egyptian Archaeology
JHS	Journal of Hellenic Studies
JRA	Journal of Roman Archaeology
JRS	Journal of Roman Studies
KP	Der Kleine Pauly. Lexikon der Antike, hrsg. von K. Ziegler und W. Sontheimer, 1–5, München 1964–1975.
LAW	Lexikon der alten Welt, Zürich – Stuttgart 1965.

LCL	Loeb Classical Library
LEC	Les Études Classiques
Lex. Ägypt.	Lexikon der Ägyptologie, 1–7, hrsg. von W. Helck, E. Otto, W. Westendorf, Wiesbaden 1975–1992.
Lex. Hellen.	Lexikon des Hellenismus, hrsg. von H.H. Schmitt und E. Vogt, Wiesbaden 2005.
LIMC	Lexicon Iconographicum Mythologiae Classicae, 1–9, Zürich – München – Düsseldorf 1981–1999.
LSCG	Lois sacrées des cités grecques, éd. par F. Sokolowski, Paris 1969 (École Française d'Athènes. Travaux et mémoires 18).
LSJ	A Greek-English Lexicon compiled by H.G. Liddell and R. Scott. Revised and augmented throughout by H.S. Jones. With a revised supplement 1996, Oxford 1996.
MDAI (A)	Mitteilungen des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts (Athenische Abteilung)
MGH AA	Monumenta Germaniae Historica. Auctores Antiquissimi, 1–15, Berolini 1877–1919 (reprint Berlin 1961).
MGH Scr. Rer. Mer.	Monumenta Germaniae Historica. Scriptores Rerum Merovingicarum, 1–7, Hannoverae 1884–1919.
MGH SS	Monumenta Germaniae Historica. Scriptores, 1–32, Hannoverae 1826–1913.
MH	Museum Helveticum
NJA	Neue Jahrbücher für das klassische Altertum
NJWJ	Neue Jahrbücher für Wissenschaft und Jugendbildung
OCD	Oxford Classical Dictionary, ed. by S. Hornblower and A. Spawforth, Oxford ³ 1996.
OGIS	Orientis Graeci Inscriptiones Selectae, ed. W. Dittenberger, Leipzig 1903–1905.
OLZ	Orientalische Literaturzeitung
PACA	Proceedings of the African Classical Association
PCG	Poetae Comici Graeci, edd. R. Kassel, C. Austin, Berlin – New York 1983 ff.
PG	Patrologiae cursus completus, Series Graeca, ed. J.P. Migne, 1–161, Paris 1857–1866.
PGM	Papyri Graecae Magicae. Die griechischen Zauberpapyri, 2. Auflage hrsg. von K. Preisendanz, A. Henrichs, Stuttgart 1973–1974.
PhU	Philologische Untersuchungen
PhW	Philologische Wochenschrift
PL	Patrologiae cursus completus, Series Latina, ed. J. P. Migne, 1–217, Paris 1844–1855.
PLS	Patrologiae Latinae Supplementum, edd. A. Hamman, L. Guillaumin, 1–5, Paris 1958 – 1970.
PMG	Poetae Melici Graeci, ed. D.L. Page, Oxford 1962.
PTS	Patristische Texte und Studien, Berlin 1963 ff.
QUCC	Quaderni Urbinati di Cultura Classica
RA	Revue Archéologique
RAC	Reallexikon für Antike und Christentum, hrsg. von Th. Klauser et al., Stuttgart 1950 ff.
RE	Paulys Realencyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft. Neue Bearbeitung hrsg. von G. Wissowa, W. Kroll, K. Mittelhaus, K. Ziegler, Stuttgart 1893–1980.
REA	Revue des Études Anciennes

REG	Revue des Études Grecques
REL	Revue des Études Latines
RFIC	Rivista di Filologia e di Istruzione Classica
RGA	Reallexikon der Germanischen Altertumskunde. 2., völlig neu bearbeitete und stark erweiterte Auflage, hrsg. von J. Hoops et al., 1–35, Berlin – New York 1973–2007.
RGG ³	Die Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart. Handwörterbuch für Theologie und Religionswissenschaft. 3. völlig neu bearbeitete Auflage, hrsg. von K. Galling, 1–6, Tübingen 1957–1965.
RGRW	Religions in the Graeco-Roman World
RGVV	Religionsgeschichtliche Versuche und Vorarbeiten, Gießen – Berlin 1903 ff.
RhM	Rheinisches Museum
RHR	Revue de l'Histoire de Religions
RIL	Rendiconti del Istituto Lombardo, Classe di Lettere, Scienze morali e storiche
RML	Ausführliches Lexikon der griechischen und römischen Mythologie, hrsg. von W.H. Roscher et al., 1–6, Leipzig 1884–1937.
RPh	Revue de Philologie
SAWW	Sitzungsberichte der Akademie der Wissenschaften Wien
SBAW	Sitzungsberichte der Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften
SCh	Sources Chrétiennes, Paris 1942 ff.
SCI	Scripta Classica Israelica
SCO	Studi Classici e Orientali
SEG	Supplementum Epigraphicum Graecum, Leiden-Amsterdam 1923 ff.
SGRR	Studies in Greek and Roman Religion, Leiden 1980 ff.
SHAW	Sitzungsberichte der Heidelberger Akademie der Wissenschaften
SIFC	Studi Italiani di Filologia Classica
SIG	Sylloge Inscriptionum Graecarum, ed. W. Dittenberger, 1–4, Leipzig ³ 1915– ³ 1924.
SÖAW	Sitzungsberichte der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften
SPAW	Sitzungsberichte der Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften
SSR	Socratis et Socraticorum Reliquiae. Collegit, disposuit, apparatibus notisque instruxit G. Giannantoni, 1–4, Napoli 1990 (Elenchos. Collana di testi e studi sul pensiero antico 18).
SVF	Stoicorum Veterum Fragmenta, 1–3, ed. J. ab Arnim, Lipsiae 1903–1905 (reprint Stuttgart 1968).
TAPhA	Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association
ThGL	Thesaurus Graecae Linguae ab H. Stephano constructus (...) tertio ediderunt C.B. Hase, G.R.L. de Sinner, Th.Fix, 1–8, Paris 1831–1865.
ThWNT	Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament, hrsg. von G. Kittel und G. Friedrich, 1–10, Stuttgart 1933–1979.
TrGF	Tragicorum Graecorum Fragmenta, t.1, edd. B. Snell – R. Kannicht, Göttingen ² 1986; t. 5: Euripides, ed. R. Kannicht, Göttingen 2004.
TU	Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur, hrsg. von A. Harnack, O. Gebhardt, C. Schmidt, Leipzig-Berlin 1882 ff.
UaLG	Untersuchungen zur antiken Literatur und Geschichte
VChr	Vigiliae Christianae
WdF	Wege der Forschung
WKlPh	Wochenschrift für Klassische Philologie
WSt	Wiener Studien
WüJbb	Würzburger Jahrbücher
WUNT	Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament
WZ	Wissenschaftliche Zeitschrift (der Universität...)

YCS	Yale Classical Studies
ZDMG	Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft
ZNW	Zeitschrift für die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft
ZPE	Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik
ZRGG	Zeitschrift für Religions- und Geistesgeschichte

I. The life of Euhemerus

1. Dating Euhemerus

Some scholars provide exact dates for Euhemerus' life,¹ usually c. 340–260 BC, but this is mere speculation not based on any of the ancient sources. The first to propose such dates was probably Geyza Némethy (1865–1937), who published Euhemerus in 1889.² It is easy to work out how he arrived at these dates. Assuming Euhemerus had reached his acme in 300 BC, Némethy calculated that he must have been born 40 years earlier and died 40 years later. Though quite unfounded, these dates were next repeated in various encyclopaedias as well as histories of religion, philosophy and literature.³ Raymond de Block's claim that Euhemerus lived in the years 330–240 is also unsubstantiated.⁴ Realising that there are no direct references to Euhemerus' life, some scholars have tried to determine when he lived by searching for references in Euhemerus' own works or those of contemporary writers.

At the start of his *Ἱερὰ Ἀναγραφή* (*Sacred History* or *Sacred Record*), Euhemerus states that he was a friend (φίλος) of king Cassander and that it was at this monarch's request that he had set out on his voyage.⁵ Many scholars believe this statement provides exceptionally valuable information.⁶ We

- 1 Holzberg, *Novel-like Works* (2003), 621, n. 3, considers the possibility of 'Euhemerus' being the fictitious name of the narrator and not of the author. This hypothesis would make sense if the name Euhemerus was a *hapax legomenon*, but in fact it appears quite frequently in the Greek language. See Fraser, Matthews, *A Lexicon of Greek Personal Names* (1987–2005), I–IV, s.v. Εὐήμερος.
- 2 Némethy, *Euhemeri reliquiae* (1889), 5.
- 3 E.g. Susemihl, *Geschichte* (1891), I, 317, n. 36; Giangrande, *Les utopies grecques* (1976/77), 123; Bertelli, *L'utopia* (1982), 559; Muth, *Einführung* (1998), 186, n. 507; Goulet, *Évhémère* (2000), 403.
- 4 Block, *Évhémère* (1876), 6; Buffière, *Les mythes d'Homère* (1956), 245.
- 5 Diod. VI 1, 4 = T 3. I cite testimonia regarding Euhemerus from my own edition (Stuttgart–Leipzig 1991). For more on φίλοι in Hellenistic courts, see e.g. Habicht, *Die herrschende Gesellschaft* (1958), 1–16 = *The Ruling Class* (2006), 26–40; Herman, *The Friends* (1980/81), 103–149; Walbank, *Monarchies* (1984), 68–71; Carsana, *Le dirigenze* (1996), 69–86; Herman, *The Court Society* (1997), 213–215; Savalli-Lestrade, *Les Philoi Royaux* (1998); Meissner, *Hofmann* (2000), 1–36; Schmitt, *Hofitel* (2005), 463–465.
- 6 E.g. Sieroka, *De Euhemero* (1869), 28; Susemihl, *Geschichte* (1891), I, 316, n. 33; van Gils, *Quaestiones Euhemereae* (1902), 14; Salin, *Platon* (1921), 279, n. 5; Tarn, *Alexander* (1933), 45–46; Vallauri, *Evemero* (1956), 45 (even dates the years of the voyage as 300–298!); Taeger, *Charisma* (1957), I, 396; Griffiths, *Plutarch's De*

know that Cassander ruled Macedonia in the years 317/316–298/297, and received the title of king in 305. Nevertheless, it has been rightly pointed out that this statement could very well be mere literary fiction.⁷ After all, Euhemerus did want his account to appear to be as authentic as possible and for this very reason he gave a fictitious justification for embarking on his voyage from Arabia Felix, i.e. Yemen, during which he was to discover a group of islands in the Indian Ocean. Indeed, the genuineness of his voyage was already doubted in those ancient times.⁸ That it is why I consider it wrong to treat a statement that smacks so much of literary fiction as valid historical evidence.

Although William W. Tarn (1869–1957)⁹ did try to prove the truthfulness of Euhemerus' words with a number of hypotheses, none of these can be verified. Tarn assumed that in the winter of 303 Cassander, Lysimachus and Ptolemy I tried to reach an agreement with Seleucus to join forces against the Antigonids. But when Antigonos Monophthalmus blocked all the normal routes, Ptolemy sent men on fast camels across the Isthmus of the Arabian Peninsula via Jauf to Babylon. Cassander's messenger was supposed to be Euhemerus, who would later claim that he knew Arabia.¹⁰ Moreover, Tarn assumed that Euhemerus belonged to a group of philosophers associated with Cassander. This group was supposed to include the Peripatetics Theophrastus of Eresos, Demetrius of Phalerum and Dicaearchus of Messene. It is strange that a view so quite unconfirmed by any historical sources should find so many supporters.¹¹ Otto Weinreich (1886–1972) even went so far as

Iside (1970), 379; Fraser, *Ptol. Alexandria* (1972), I, 292; Giangrande, *Les utopies* (1976/77), 123; Hani, *La religion* (1976), 133; Kuch, *Funktionswandlungen des antiken Romans* (1989), 54; Sonnabend, *Die Freundschaften der Gelehrten* (1996), 227.

7 Block, *op.cit.*, 6; Jacoby, *Euemerios* (1907), 953; Herter, *Kallimachos* (1931), 426; Thraede, *Euhemerismus* (1966), 878; Braunert, *Staatstheorie* (1968), 66, n.109; Meissner, *Historiker* (1992), 445. Also see Colpe, *Utopie and Atheismus* (1995), 37–38 'Es ist nicht zu entscheiden und auch nicht wichtig, ob die Reisen trotzdem stattgefunden haben.'

8 Eratosthenes (I B 7 Berger) ap. Str. II 4, 2 p. 104 (T 5) et Str. I 3,1 p. 47 (T 4); Apollodorus (FGrHist 244 F 157a) ap. Str. VII 3, 6 p. 299 (T 6); Str. II 3, 5 p. 102 (T 7 A); Plut. *Is. et Os.* 23 p. 360 AB (T 15).

9 Tarn, *Alexander* (1933), 24–25, 45.

10 Diod. V 41, 2–3 = T 29.

11 Polet, *Deux utopies* (1947), 54–55; Festugière, *La révélation* (1950), II, 192; Braunert, *Staatstheorie* (1968), 66, n. 109; Giangrande, *Les utopies* (1976/77), 124; Sonnabend, *Die Freundschaften* (1996), 229–230; Landucci Gattinoni, *L'arte del potere* (2003), 141. Whereas van der Meer, *Euhemerus* (1949), 136–156, tried to prove that Euhemerus was a Peripatetic using quite different arguments to those posited by Tarn. This theory was rightly rejected by Nock, review van der Meer (1950), 88, and M. van Straaten, 'Mnemosyne' 5, 1952, 162. There are also no grounds to support the view held by older scholars that Euhemerus belonged to the Cyrenaic school. See chapter VI 1, n. 2.

to call Euhemerus a court philosopher (*Hofphilosoph*).¹² It is therefore necessary to clearly state that Euhemerus' work does not allow us to ascertain whether the author was ever present at Cassander's court.

Other scholars have searched for information regarding Euhemerus in the writings of contemporary authors. Two works by Callimachus of Cyrene have been considered, *Iambus* 1, 9–11 (T 1 A) and *Hymn* 1, 8–9 (T 2), although Euhemerus' name appears in neither¹³. However, already in ancient times writers saw allusions to Euhemerus in *Iambus* 1,¹⁴ as do most modern scholars.¹⁵ The poet Hipponax calls on philologists to head for temple beyond the walls of Alexandria, where ἄδικα βιβλία are vaingloriously scribbled by the old man who invented the Panchaeon Zeus. According to διήγησις the temple was the Sarapeum of Parmenion,¹⁶ and therefore it should not be confused with the famous Sarapeum built by the Ptolemaic rulers within the city walls in the Rhacotis district.¹⁷ Up until 1961 it was believed that Callimachus was alluding to Euhemerus when he was still alive,

12 Weinreich, *Menekrates Zeus* (1933), 4–15. Similarly, Salin, *Platon* (1921), 279, n. 5.

13 ἐς τὸ πρὸ τείχευς ἱρὸν ἄλεες δευτε
οὐ τὸν πάλαι Πάγκαλον ὁ πλάσας Ζᾶνα
γέρον λαλάζων ἄδικα βιβλία ψήχει. (Callim. *Iamb.* 1, 9–11)

‘Κρῆτες ἀεὶ ψεῦσται’· καὶ γὰρ τάφον, ὃ ἄνα, σεῖο
Κρῆτες ἐτεκτῆναντο· σὺ δ’ οὐ θάνες, ἐσσι γὰρ αἰεὶ. (Callim. *Hymn. Iov.* 8–9).

14 Aëtius, *Plac.* I 7, 1 p. 297–298 Diels ap. Ps.-Plut. *Plac. phil.* 880 DE (T 16); *Schol. Cl. Al. Protr.* II 24, 2 (T 1 C); *Schol. ad Tzetz. Alleg. Iliad.* IV 37 (T 1 B).

15 Only Tarn, *Alexander* (1933), 44–45, fails to see any allusion to Euhemerus.

16 ὑποτίθεται φητὶν Ἰππώνακτα συγκαλοῦντα τοὺς φιλολόγους εἰς τὸ Παρμενίονος καλούμενον Σαραπίδειον Dieg. VI 2–4 ap. Pfeiffer, *Callimachus* (1949), I, 163. The Parmenion Sarapeum is no doubt one and the same as Parmeniscus' Sarapeum, which was mentioned by P. Cairo Zenon 59355, 1.102–103 et 1.128 (III 89–90 Edgar), in 243 BC, and Ps-Callisth. *Hist. Alex. M.* I 33, 13. See Fraser, *Ptol. Alexandria* (1972), I, 270. For more on the Sarapis cult, see e.g. Roeder, *Sarapis* (1920), 2394–2426; Stambaugh, *Sarapis* (1972); Hornbostel, *Sarapis* (1973); Huß, *Der makedonische König* (1994), 58–68; Pfeiffer, *The God Serapis* (2008), 387–408; Bergmann, *Sarapis* (2010), 109–135.

17 The history of the Sarapeum in Rhacotis is most accurately recounted by Sabottka, *Das Serapeum* (2008), esp. 67–245. The author describes three phases: a) early Ptolemaic architecture, b) the construction of the great temple by Ptolemy III Euergetes (246–222), c) the expansion of the Sarapeum in the 2nd century AD. Also see Rowe, *A Contribution* (1957), 485–512; McKenzie, *Glimpsing Alexandria* (2003), 50–56; McKenzie, Gibson, Reys, *Reconstructing the Serapeum* (2004), 79–90. The identification of both temples has been rejected by: Pfeiffer, *Callimachus* (1953), II, pp. XXXIX–XL; Fraser, *Current Problems* (1967), 39–40; Fraser, *Ptol. Alexandria* (1972), I, 270–271; Weber, *Dichtung* (1993), 280; Kerkhecker, *Callimachus' Book of Iambi* (1999), 22; Sabottka, *op. cit.*, 34 with n. 17. Scholars supporting the view that this was the same temple do so arbitrarily, ignoring literary sources and archaeological evidence. For example, Rees, *Callimachus* (1961) 1–3 and Stambough, *Sarapis* (1972), 71.

but then B.R. Rees suggested that in *Iambus* 1 the reference is to a statue of a deceased poet.¹⁸ His arguments were based on the assumption that since there were statues of Greek philosophers and poets in the exedra of the Sarapeum in Memphis,¹⁹ a similar group of statues must have also existed at the Great Sarapeum in Alexandria. However, Rees erroneously presumed the Parmenion Sarapeum and the Rhacotis Sarapeum to be one and the same. Moreover, it is hard to explain why anyone should wish to erect a statue of a less than universally renowned writer. Nonetheless, the greatest problem stems from the fact that we do not know exactly when *Iambus* 1 was written. Most scholars openly admit this.²⁰ Some assume that Callimachus wrote it in his old age,²¹ while Claude Meillier believed it must have been written sometime between 280 and 260.²²

Many scholars believe that Callimachus alluded to Euhemerus in his criticism of the Cretan claim of Zeus' tomb existing on Crete.²³ I have also

-
- 18 Rees, l.c. This view has been accepted by Clayman, *Callimachus' Iambi* (1980), 11, n. 2; Weber, *Dichtung* (1993), 280, n. 5, but rejected by others, e.g. D'Alessio, *Callimaco* (1996), 46, n. 31. Also see comments regarding Rees' hypothesis made by Fraser, *Ptol. Alexandria* (1972), II, 453, n. 824.
 - 19 See Lauer, Picard, *Les statues ptolémaïques* (1955), esp. 151 ff.; Schefold, *Die Dichter und Weisen* (1957), 33–38, esp. 34–36; Pietrzykowski, *Rzeczy* (1976). Eleven of the statues in Memphis have survived (including those of Homer, Hesiod, Thales, Heraclitus, Protagoras, Pindar and Plato) but there used be more. One should note that Breccia, *Alexandria ad Aegyptum* (1922), 115, mentions an account by J.F. Mimaud (1774–1837), according to which the Alexandrian Sarapeum had eleven statues, each holding a papyrus scroll. Although the historical value is difficult to assess, this account is willingly referred to by some contemporary scholars, e.g. Rowe, *A Contribution* (1957), 501–502.
 - 20 Jacoby, *Euemerios* (1907), 953; Herter, *Kallimachos* (1931), 426; Pfeiffer, *Neue Lesungen zu Kallimachos-Papyri* (1938), 70, n. 6; Lesky, *Geschichte* (1971), 803; Herter, *Kallimachos* (1973), 217; Bulloch, *Callimachus* (1985), 568–569; D'Alessio, *Callimaco* (1996), 45–46.
 - 21 Dawson, *The Iambi of Callimachus* (1950), 148; Pfeiffer, *Callimachus* (1953), II, p. XXXIX, n. 8.
 - 22 Meillier, *Callimaque* (1979), 202 'entre 280 et 260, avec une probabilité plus grande en faveur d'une date haute.' Only a few scholars have given more precise dates: around the year 280 according to Fraser, *Current Problems* (1967), 39–40 'a date not much, if at all, later than 280'; and c. 270 according to Beloch, *Griechische Geschichte* (1927), IV 2, 586–587, as well as Vallauri, *Evemero* (1956), 5.
 - 23 Némethy, *Euhemeri reliquiae* (1889), 7; Jacoby, *Euemerios* (1907), 953; Wendland, *Die hellenistisch-römische Kultur* (1912), 120; Geffcken, *Euhemerism* (1912), 573; Rohde, *Psyche* (1925), I, 130–131, n. 1; Wilamowitz-Moellendorf, *Hellenistische Dichtung* (1924), II, 3; van der Meer, *Euhemerus* (1949), 104–105; Nestle, *Griechische Geistesgeschichte* (1956), 411, n. 101; Vallauri, *Evemero* (1956), 4; Thraede, *Euhemerismus* (1966), 878; Dörrie, *Euhemerios* (1967), 414; Meillier, *Callimaque* (1979), 202; McLennan, *Callimachus, Hymn to Zeus* (1977), 38; Hammerstaedt, *Kallimachos* (2001), 1219–1223. Only Rostagni, *Poeti alessandrini* (1916), 318, n. 37, believed Callimachus was alluding to Dosiades.

considered this text to be a testimony in my own edition of Euhemerus (T 2). Today, however, I am more inclined to include it among the *testimonia dubia* because Callimachus may equally well have been referring to the old Cretan tradition regarding Zeus' tomb, a theme also used by Euhemerus.²⁴ Although Callimachus knew the Ἱερὰ Ἀναγραφὴ when writing *Iambus 1*, one cannot prove that he was alluding to this work in the *Hymn to Zeus*. It is generally believed that Callimachus wrote the *Hymn* at an early stage of his career, in the 280s or 270s BC, and that this work was dedicated to Ptolemy II Philadelphus.²⁵ But all attempts to date it any more accurately than that are purely subjective.²⁶ Hence it appears that even a very detailed analyses of *Iambus* and the *Hymn* fail to produce any reliable guidelines for dating Euhemerus and we are therefore forced to concede that we do not know when exactly Euhemerus lived. At most one can say that he lived in the 4th/3rd century BC.²⁷

2. Place of birth

Most of the ancient sources state that Euhemerus came from Messene²⁸ but fail to specify whether this was the city in Sicily or on the Peloponnese. This

Whereas Fraser, *Ptol. Alexandria* (1972), I, 295, II, 457, n. 840, and Rusten, *Dionysius Scytobrachion* (1982), 105, n. 24, maintained that this was not an allusion to Euhemerus.

- 24 For more on how this tradition emerged and its influence, see chapter III 2 A c.
- 25 Perhaps only Carrière, *Philadelphie ou Sôtêr?* (1969), 85–93, has associated the *Hymn to Zeus* with Ptolemy I and dates it to the years 286–283. Meillier, *Callimaque* (1979), 61–78, however, assumes that Callimachus was making an allusion to Magas, the king of Cyrene.
- 26 12 Dystros (i.e. the day Ptolemy II was born) 285/284 or 284/283: Clauss, *Lies and Allusions* (1986), 159; 283/282: Eichgrün, *Kallimachos* (1961), 36–39; McLennan, *Callimachus* (1977), 99; 283/280: Meincke, *Untersuchungen* (1966), 165–166, n. 2; Bulloch, *Callimachus* (1985), 550; Schwinge, *Künstlichkeit der alexandrinischen Poesie* (1986), 72, n. 76; ca. 280: Maass, *Aratea* (1892), 345; Cahen, *Les hymnes* (1930), 10 ‘peu postérieure à 280’; van der Meer, *Euhemerus* (1949), 11; c. 280/275: Fraser, *Ptol. Alexandria* (1972), I, 652, II, 915, n. 284; prior to 278 (i.e. before the wedding with Arsinoë): Jacoby, *Euhemerios* (1907), 953; Herter, *Kallimachos* (1931), 438; ca. 275: Vallauri, *Evemero* (1956), 4; before 270: Beloch, *Griechische Geschichte* (1927), 587 ‘um oder etwas vorher’.
- 27 E.g. Müller, *Geschichte* (1972), I, 265. See chapter II 3, n. 16, for more on scholars who date the Ἱερὰ Ἀναγραφὴ to ca. 300 BC.
- 28 Messene: Polyb. *Hist.* XXXIV 5 ap. Str. II 4, 2 p. 104 (T 5); Diod. VI 1,1 ap. Eus. *Praep. ev.* II 2, 52 (T 25); Plut. *Is. et Os.* 23 p. 360 A (T 15); Ael. *Var. hist.* II 31 (T 22 A); Lact. *Div. inst.* I 11, 33 (T 65); Lact. *Epit. div. inst.* 13,1 (T 10); *Etym. Magn.* s.v. Βποτός (T 78); Eustath. *Comment. ad Hom. Odyss.* III 381 (T 22 B) *Schol. Cl. Al. Protr.* II 24, 2 (T 1 C).

is a problem that cannot be convincingly resolved,²⁹ but there are certain clues that would indicate that is rather the Sicilian polis. The poet Ennius (239–169), who came from Southern Italy, translated into Latin the works of three Greek authors. Two of these, Arcestratus of Gela and (Pseudo-) Epicharmus, most certainly were Sicilians. One of them could have also been Euhemerus.³⁰ Moreover, two Christian writers, Clement of Alexandria and Arnobius, maintain that Euhemerus came from the Sicilian city of Acragas.³¹ H.F. van der Meer assumed that Euhemerus may have lived in that Sicilian city for a time.³² More recently Franco De Angelis and Benjamin Garstad tried to prove that Euhemerus came from Sicily³³ on the basis that his views were supposedly shaped in Sicilian realities. This view is supported by the existence in Sicily of cults of outstanding people, religious syncretism and the fact that the inhabitants of the Lipari Islands, not far from Messene, practiced communal ownership. The authors nevertheless concede that their article is ‘profoundly speculative’, and the examples they use can easily be disputed.

No one has as yet explained as to why the doxographical tradition maintains Euhemerus came from Tegea on the Peloponnese.³⁴ Only Athenaeus of Naucratis (c. 200 AD) called Euhemerus Κῶς.³⁵ Felix Jacoby (1876–1959) assumed that the island of Cos became the author’s new home in the Ptolemaic state.³⁶ Such a possibility cannot be ruled out but neither can it be confirmed. The epithet Βεργαῖος, on the other hand, does not define Euhemerus’ place of origin but the opinion that he was a liar just like Antiphanes of Berge.³⁷ The ancients used the Βεργαῖος nickname to denote ‘untrue or deceptive’.³⁸

29 Némethy, *Euhemeri reliquiae* (1889), 4; van Gils, *Quaestiones* (1902), 9. Perhaps only Griffiths, *Plutarch’s De Iside* (1970), 379, believed this was in reference to Messene on the Peloponnese.

30 Thus Susemihl, *Geschichte* (1891), I, 316, n. 32; Kappelmacher, *Die Literatur der Römer* (1926), 92; Waszink, *Problems Concerning the Satira of Ennius* (1972), 120; Gratwick, *Ennius* (1982), 157, n. 5.

31 Cl. Alex. *Protr.* II 24, 2 (T 20); Arnob. *Adv. nat.* IV 29 (T 21).

32 van der Meer, *Euhemerus* (1949), 101.

33 De Angelis, Garstad, *Euhemerus in Context* (2006), 211–242, esp. 213–218.

34 Aëtius, *Plac.* I 7,1 p. 297–298 Diels ap. Ps.-Plut. *Plac. phil.* 880 D (T 16); Theodor. *Graec. affect. cur.* II 112; III 4 (T 17 A-B); Ps.-Galen. *Hist. philos.* 35 p. 617–618 Diels (T 18). K. Mras in his index to Eusebius’ *Praeparatio evangelica* (Berlin 1983, II 490) is wrong to distinguish between an Euhemerus of Messene and one from Tegea. There can be no doubt that this was one and the same man.

35 Athen. XIV 77, 658 E = Euhem. T 77.

36 Jacoby, *Euemeros* (1907), 952. Similarly Fraser, *Ptol. Alexandria* (1972), II, 454, n. 829.

37 Eratosth. (I B 7 Berger) ap. Str. I 3, 1 p. 47 (T 4). Cf. Steph. Byz. s.v. Βέργη· πόλις Θράκης ... ἐξ ἧς ὁ Βεργαῖος Αντιφάνης ... ἀφ’ οὗ καὶ παροιμία βεργαῖζειν ἀντὶ τοῦ μηδὲν ἀληθὲς λέγειν See Knaack, *Antiphanes von Berge* (1906), 135–138; Weinreich, *Antiphanes and Münchhausen* (1942), 10–44, 123–131; Walbank, *A Historical Commentary* (1979), III, 592.

38 Βεργαῖον δῆγμα (Str. II 3, 5 p. 100); Βεργαῖον ὄθλον (Alexis, *Hesione* fr. 90 [PCG II 67]). See Luppe, *Das Komikerglossar* (1967), 99–102; Arnott, *Alexis* (1996), 239–

3. Place of activity

The lack of concrete evidence regarding Euhemerus' life has led scholars to resort to various hypotheses. In reference to the autobiographical statement in his work (T 3), some believe that Euhemerus was active at Cassander's Macedonian court (see chapter I 1). Rudolf Hirzel (1846–1917) also believed Euhemerus was active in Macedonia because in his opinion the *Ἱερὰ Ἀναγραφὴ* was a satire on the ruler cult that had emerged in Cassander's circle and that it had an anti-Egyptian slant.³⁹ Others, however, maintain that Euhemerus lived in the Ptolemaic state. These opinions are based on allusions in the works of Callimachus (T 1 A and T 2) who lived in Alexandria and also on F. Jacoby theory, according to which Euhemerus made the island of Cos his second home (see n. 36). Moreover, some scholars reckon that Euhemerus' description of society on the island of Panchaea bears some resemblance to Ptolemaic Egypt.⁴⁰ Thus the conclusion that Euhemerus must have lived in that country.⁴¹ Peter Marshall Fraser (1918–2007) proposed a compromise theory, according to which Euhemerus first stayed at Cassander's court in Macedonia, and, after his patron's death in 298/297, he moved to Egypt, where he spent the rest of his life, staying chiefly in Alexandria and on the island of Cos.⁴² One has to concede that this hypothesis is very tempting, but the evidence is far too tenuous.

It is quite plausible that Euhemerus lived for some time in the Ptolemaic state, but there are no grounds to assume that he actually wrote his book there.⁴³ We also do not know when and for what particular reason Euhemerus wrote the *Ἱερὰ Ἀναγραφὴ*.⁴⁴ The proposed timeframes span over 40 years, from the last decade of the 4th century to when Ptolemy II Philadelphus proclaimed the *θεοὶ ἄδελφοί* cult in 272/271.⁴⁵

240. Cf. Ps.-Scymn. *Orb. descr.* 653–655 (GGM I 221) and Marcian., *Epit. peripl. Men.* 1 (GGM I 565).

39 Hirzel, *Der Dialog* (1895), I, 394–396. Also Dubielzig, *Roman* (2005), 939 believes that Euhemerus 'zeitweilig am Hofe König Kassandros' von Makedonien lebte' but does not justify his view. Similarly Gehrke, *Geschichte des Hellenismus* (2003), 51.

40 For more on Panchaeian society, see chapter IV 2.

41 E.g. Braunert, *Staatstheorie* (1969), 58; Müller, *Geschichte* (1972), 267; Stambaugh, *Sarapis* (1972), 71; Johnston, *Vergil's Agricultural Golden Age* (1980), 65; Garland, *Les sociétés sans esclaves* (1981), 136; Müller, *Überlegungen* (1993), 297; Weber, *Dichtung* (1993), 147, n. 1.

42 Fraser, *Ptol. Alexandria* (1972), I, 292–293. Other scholars to write about Euhemerus' stay in Macedonia and Egypt include Vallauri, *Evemero* (1956), 5, and Bertelli, *L'utopia* (1982), 559.

43 According to Nock, review van der Meer (1950), 89 'Euhemerus did write at Alexandria' and Bertelli, *Il modello della società rurale* (1976), 201, n. 70. Cf. Müller, *Geschichte* (1972), 267 'der vermutlich den grössten Teil seines Lebens in Ägypten verbrachte'; Baumgarten, *Heiliges Wort* (1998), 186.

44 See chapter VI.

45 For more on the problem with dating the *Ἱερὰ Ἀναγραφὴ*, also see chapter II 3.

Nothing is certain as to where and when Euhemerus was born or as to where he was active. All posited theories are of a subjective nature and all can be easily dismissed. Some, particularly those put forward by renowned scholars, have been accepted as historical facts, making their way into encyclopaedias as well as histories of religion, philosophy and literature.⁴⁶ I nevertheless believe we should be aware of the real state of our knowledge. It is better to admit to ignorance rather than uncritically repeat unsubstantiated views.⁴⁷ Sometimes one needs to have the courage to say *ignoramus et ignorabimus*.

4. Euhemerus in ancient tradition

It is remarkable that there exist several quite independent traditions regarding Euhemerus which simultaneously treat him as a geographer, historian, atheist philosopher and poet.

A. Geographer

Euhemerus' book describing a voyage from Arabia Felix to the south, during which he was to have found a hitherto unknown group of islands in the Indian Ocean, caught the attention of ancient geographers and historians. However, already Eratosthenes of Cyrene (3rd century BC) was under no illusion that this was anything other than literary fiction⁴⁸ and called Euhemerus Βεργαῖος, i.e. a liar.⁴⁹ Likewise, in the 2nd century BC Apollodorus of Athens decidedly rejected the credibility of Euhemerus' account.⁵⁰ On the other hand, a rather ambiguous view is held by the historian Polybius (2nd century BC), who believed it was better to believe Euhemerus than Pytheas of Massalia.⁵¹ One cannot rule out that Polybius also doubted the authenticity of Euhemerus' voyage although he considered him less of a liar, since he only spoke of discovering a new island, Panchaea, whereas Pytheas claimed to have reached the very northern perimeters of Europe. Polybius' attitude to Pytheas seems to be well explained by Frank William Walbank (1909–

46 E.g. Fusillo, *Euhemerios* (1998), 236 in reference to F. Jacoby states 'die Schrift des E. wird im alg. auf 280 v. Chr. datiert'. From the author of an entry in a serious encyclopaedia (DNP) one could expect greater research into the problem and not mere repetition of a highly debatable hypothesis.

47 Perhaps only Meissner, *Historiker* (1992), 445, has admitted, 'über das wirkliche Leben des Euhemerios wissen wir eigentlich nichts'.

48 Eratosth. I B 6 Berger ap. Str. I 3, 1 p. 47 = Euhem. T 4; I B 7 Berger ap. Str. II 4, 2 p. 104 = Euhem. T 5.

49 See chapter I, n. 37 and 38.

50 Apollod. FGrHist 244 F 157a ap. Str. VII 3, 6 p. 299 = Euhem. T 6.

51 Polyb. XXXIV 5 ap. Str. II 4, 2 p. 104 = Pytheas F 21 Bianchetti = Euhem. T 5.

2008),⁵² who argued that the historian's aim was to discredit Pytheas among readers so as to present himself as the first person to have discovered the way to the Atlantic Ocean. Polybius emphasised that he had travelled in Africa, Spain and Gaul and reached their coasts.⁵³

In the 1st century BC Diodorus Siculus treated the book as the account of a real voyage and included its extensive summary in his *Bibliotheca historica* (V 41–46; VI 1). But somewhat later the geographer Strabo decidedly rejected the authenticity of Euhemerus' voyage, as did Plutarch (before 50 – after 120) in his *De Iside et Osiride* treatise.⁵⁴ Therefore most ancient authors (Eratosthenes, Apollodorus, Strabo, Plutarch) saw the fictitious nature of Euhemerus' work, whereas only Diodorus considered the author to be a genuine explorer.

B. Historian

Diodorus Siculus is the only pagan author who considered Euhemerus to be a historian (VI 1, 3 = T 8), though later several Christian authors also held this view. Minucius Felix (c. 200), Lactantius (c. 250–330) and Augustine (354–430) saw in Euhemerus an ally in combating paganism because he had argued that the pagan gods were merely deified humans.⁵⁵ Particularly Lactantius and Augustine stressed that Euhemerus was a historian rather than a poet and for this reason considered his views to be correct.

C. Atheist Philosopher

Doxographers⁵⁶ were only interested in the fact that Euhemerus regarded the Olympian gods to be deified humans. That is why he was treated as an impi-

52 Walbank, *Polemic in Polybius* (1962), 10–11, reprint in *idem, Selected Papers* (1985), 276–277; *idem, Polybius* (1972), 126–127. Similarly Schepens, *Polemic* (1990), 43, n. 16. One should add that Polybius also criticised other historians in book XII of *The Histories*. Also see e.g. Meister, *Historische Kritik bei Polybios* (1975), esp. 3–55 (Timaeus), 56–66 (Theopompus), 67–80 (Ephorus); Schepens, *op. cit.*, 39–61.

53 Polyb. III 59, 7. A detailed description of his journey to Spain and Gaul is contained in book XXXIV. Also see Paus. VIII 30, 8 ἐπὶ γῆν καὶ θάλασσαν πᾶσαν πλανηθεῖν (scil. Polybius).

54 Plut. *Is. et Os.* 23, 360 AB = T 15.

55 Min. Fel. *Oct.* 21, 1–2 (T 9); Lact. *Epit. div. inst.* 13, 1–3 (T 10); Lact. *Div. inst.* I 11, 33 (T 65); Aug. *Civ. Dei* VI 7; VII 27; (T 11–12); Aug. *Cons. evang.* I 23, 32 (T 13); Aug. *Epist.* 17, 3 (T 94).

56 On the doxographical tradition, see e.g. Diels, *Doxographi Graeci* (1879), 1–263; Wyss, *Doxographie* (1959), 197–210; Mejer, *Diogenes Laertius* (1978), 81–89; Mansfeld, Runia, *Aëtiana* (1997); Bremmer, *Aëtius* (1998), 154–160;

ous man and eventually placed in the catalogue of atheists.⁵⁷ The fact that he had written a novel rather than a philosophical treatise was quite ignored and there was no reflection on whether the author actually supported the theory that religion was of human invention. Indeed, doxographers may have never actually read Euhemerus' book and simply included him in their atheist catalogues on the basis of other catalogues.⁵⁸ Studying lists of atheists, I once came to the conclusion that the first comprehensive atheist catalogue was compiled by Clitomachus of Carthage, a scholar of the Academy in Athens in the years 127/126–110/109 BC.⁵⁹ However, we do not know whether he was the first to include Euhemerus to the group of atheists. We should remember that already Callimachus accused the Ἱερὰ Ἀναγραφή author of writing ἄδικα βιβλία.⁶⁰

Some scholars believed that Euhemerus was a student of Theodorus of Cyrene or that he had belonged the Cyrenaic School, which sharply criticised folk religion.⁶¹ This hypothesis, however, is in no way supported by the sources and has therefore been rightly rejected.⁶²

D. Poet

Only Columella, the 1st century AD author of the *Res Rustica* agricultural manual, calls Euhemerus a poet.⁶³ For a long time scholars referred to this

Zhmud, *Revising Doxography* (2001), 219–243; Mansfeld, Runia, *Aëtiana* (2009); Mansfeld, Runia, *Aëtiana* (2010).

57 Euhemerus as an atheist: Cic. *Nat. deor.* I 118–119 (T 14); Plut. *Is et Os.* 23, 359 E-360 B (T 15); Aëtius, *Plac.* I 7, 1 p. 297–298 Diels ap. Ps.-Plut. *Plac. phil.* 880 D-E = Eus. *Praep. evang.* XIV 16, 1 (T 16); Theoph. *Ad Autol.* III 7, 6 (T 19); Cl. Al. *Protr.* II 24, 2 (T 20); Ael. *Var. hist.* II 31 (T 22 A); Sext. Emp. *Adv. math.* IX 17 (T 27); IX 50–52 (T 23); Arnob. *Adv. nat.* IV 29 (T 21); Theodor. *Graec. affect. cur.* II 112; III 4 (T 17 A-B); Ps.-Gal. *Hist. phil.* 35 p. 617–618 Diels (T 18); Eustath. *Comment. ad Hom. Odyss.* III 381 (T 22 B); *Schol. in Cl. Al. Protr.* II 24, 2 (T 1 C); *Schol. ad Tzetz. Alleg. Iliad.* IV 37 (T 1 B). See Winiarczyk, *Wer galt im Altertum als Atheist?* (1984), 171.

58 See Winiarczyk, *Methodisches* (1990), 2–3.

59 Winiarczyk, *Der erste Atheistenkatalog* (1976), 32–46. Also see Runia, *Atheists in Aëtius* (1996), 542–576.

60 Callim. *Iamb.* 1, 11 = T 1 A. For the meaning of the word ἄδικος, see Meillier, *Callimaque* (1979), 320, n. 38.

61 E.g. Zeller, *Die Philosophie* (1922), II 1, 342–343, 377; Praechter, *Die Philosophie* (1926), 171; Vorländer, *Geschichte* (1949), 104; Freeman, *The Pre-Socratic Philosophers* (1959), 374.

62 Block, *Évhémère* (1876), 138–141; Némethy, *Euhemeri reliquiae* (1889), 6; van Gils, *Quaestiones* (1902), 103–104; Jacoby, *Eumeros* (1907), 968; Rohde, *Der griechische Roman* (1914), 241, n. 1; Winiarczyk, *Theodoros* (1981), 92. The view posited by Vernière, *Îles mythiques* (1988), 164, that Euhemerus was ‘philosophe de l’École cynique’ is quite unfounded.

63 Colum. *Res rust.* IX 2–4 = T 24.

testimony, assuming that Ennius had translated Euhemerus' work in poetic verse.⁶⁴ It was Otto Crusius (1857–1918) who first convincingly argued that Columella did not have direct contact with Ennius' version but instead referred to the work of Hyginus. The latter mentioned Euhemerus among various other poets and therefore Columella recognised him as a poet, too.⁶⁵

64 See chapter VII.

65 Crusius, *Ad scriptores Latinos exegetica* (1892), 63–64 'Columella Euhemeri testimonium non excerpſit ex Ennii libello, quem neque per nomen citat usquam neque ad manus habuit, sed e docta Hygini disputatione tranſtulit: ubi cum plerosque auctores poetas esse videret, etiam Euhemerum Musarum thiaso inseruit.' This view was accepted by, among others: Vahlen, *Ennianae poesis reliquiae* (1903), CCXXII; Némethy, *Quaestiunculae Euhemereae* (1900), 128, van Gils, *Quaestiones* (1902), 114 and Vallauri, *Evemero* (1956), 7.

II. Euhemerus' Ἱερὰ Ἀναγραφὴ

1. The state of preservation of the work

Euhemerus' work, comprising at least three books,¹ is lost. We know of it chiefly thanks to Diodorus Siculus' summary in his *Bibliotheca historica* (V 41–46; VI 1) and to Ennius' Latin version *Euhemerus sive Sacra historia*, whose fragments have been passed on to us by Lactantius in book I of the *Divinae institutiones*.

Earlier editors (F. Jacoby, 1923, ²1957 and G. Vallauri, 1956) divided extant texts into testimonia and fragments, but such a division does not seem to be justified. For a long time Diodorus was considered a mechanical compiler who cited his sources without any alterations, but more recently the opinion of many scholars is that Diodorus summarised the works of other authors without preserving the original style.² Currently most agree that Diodorus was an independent writer with his own ideas regarding the works of others and one who applied to them his own philosophical and political views.³ One should remember that a fragment from book VI of Diodorus' *Bibliotheca historica* has survived in Eusebius of Caesarea's *Praeparatio evangelica* (c. 265–340). Therefore it is clear that a summary passed on by Diodorus cannot be considered Euhemerus' original text. It is even less appropriate to treat Latin version of Euhemerus' text as fragments because here we are dealing with a rather free interpretation partially preserved in Lactantius' work (c. 300 AD), which was only indirectly based on Ennius' translation. Hence, we do not actually possess any fragments of Euhemerus' text in the strict sense of the word.⁴

1 See Athen. XIV 77, 658 E = T 77.

2 See Palm, *Über Sprache und Stil des Diodoros* (1955), 194–195, cf. pp.15–63. Also see Dochhorn, *Ein 'Inschriftenfund'* (2000), 287–288. Honigman, *Euhemerus* (2009), 18–19, 35, disagrees, but she has not examined the way in which Diodorus worked and does not refer to the works mentioned in n. 3 below.

3 See e.g. Laqueur, *Diodorea* (1958), 290; Bidgwood, *Diodorus* (1980), 195 with n. 2 and p. 207; Càssola, *Diodoro* (1982), 725–728; Sacks, *Diodorus* (1990), 70–82; Chamoux, *Un historien mal – aimé* (1990), 243–252; Spoerri, *Diodorea* (1991), 310–319; Chamoux, *Introduction* (1993), XVIII–XXII; Wirth, *Diodor* (1993); Sacks, *Diodorus* (1994), 213–232; Green, *Diodorus* (2006), 1–47. The old point of view is presented by Stylianou, *A Historical Commentary* (1998), 1–139. Also see Bleckmann, *Diodor* (2010), 435–450.

4 Bignone, *Storia* (1946), I, 305 'Dell'Evemero di Ennio ... la maggior parte dei frammenti, o per meglio dire delle testimonianze, ci sono conservati da Lattanzio'; Magno, *Quinto Ennio* (1979), 207 'non è rimasto alcun frammento di tale opera.'

In my edition of Euhemerus (1991) I treated as *Dubia* six testimonia (T 87–92) referring to Aphrodite, the lover of Cinyras, as she had no genealogical ties with other gods. After her death, the king of Cyprus included her among the gods, establishing for her mysteries and temples. Roland J. Müller,⁵ however, drew attention to the difference between the authentic testimonia in Lactantius, which speak of Aphrodite the queen of Cyprus, who practiced prostitution,⁶ and T 87–92. Müller's arguments seem convincing and today I would classify these testimonia as *falsa*. Indeed, I would proceed similarly with regard to the abduction of Proserpina by Pluto in the *De errore profanarum religionum* by the Christian author Firmicus Maternus (4th century AD).⁷

2. Interpretation of the title

Initially the Ἱερὰ Ἀναγραφὴ title was translated as the 'Sacred Inscription'⁸ or 'Sacred Document'.⁹ F. Jacoby was the first to propose a different interpretation of the title as 'die Heilige Aufzeichnung, Schrift',¹⁰ which has been justified in detail by Karl Rupprecht.¹¹ He drew attention to the fact that the word ἀναγραφὴ is used in inscriptions to mean 'das Beschreiben, Aufschreiben' or 'Aufzählung, Aufzeichnung'. Thus the Ἱερὰ Ἀναγραφὴ would be the recording of a number of histories regarding gods or a sacred history (cf. Ennius' *Sacra historia*). Many scholars have since referred to the interpretations of Jacoby and Rupprecht.¹²

Also see Lovejoy, Boas, *Primitivism* (1935), 55 'of Euhemerus we have no original fragments'. See chapter VII 3. The situation is similar in the case of Onesicritus. See Winiarczyk, *Die hellenist. Utopien* (2011), 86, n. 77

5 Müller, *Überlegungen* (1993), 288.

6 Lact. *Div. inst.* I 17, 9–10 = T 75 A 'artem meretriciam instituit'; Lact. *Epit. div. inst.* 9, 1 = T 75 B.

7 Firm. Mat. *De err. prof. rel.* 7, 1–6 = T 93. See Müller, *Überlegungen* (1993), 288–289.

8 'The Sacred Inscription'/'die Heilige Inschrift': e.g. de Block, *Évhémère* (1876), 11; Gruppe, *Die griechischen Culte* (1887), I, 17; Salin, *Platon* (1921), 220; Nestle, *Griechische Geistesgeschichte* (1956), 409; Ferguson, *Utopias* (1975), 104.

9 'Heilige Urkunde': Ribbeck, *Geschichte* (1894), I, 46; Hirzel, *Der Dialog* (1895), I, 391; Rohde, *Der gr. Roman* (1914), 237; Bichler, *Zur historischen Beurteilung* (1984), 187.

10 Jacoby, *Euemeros* (1907), 953–954.

11 Rupprecht, *ΙΕΡΑ ΑΝΑΓΡΑΦΗ* (1924), 350–352. Also see Fornara, *FGrHist III C 1* (1994), 42–44 (Ἱερὰ ἀναγραφαί).

12 'The Sacred Writing'/'die Heilige Schrift': Bethe, *Die griechische Dichtung* (1924–1928), 318–319; Brown, *Onesicritus* (1949), 66; 'die Heilige Aufzeichnung': Lesky, *Geschichte* (1971), 875; Kytzler, *Utopisches Denken* (1973), 61; Holzberg, *Der antike Roman* (2006), 23; 'The Sacred History'/'die Heilige Geschichte': Reitzenstein,

3. When the work was written

Since we do not know the exact dates of Euhemerus' birth and death or his general *curriculum vitae*, we are unable to say when exactly the Ἱερὰ Ἀναγραφὴ was written. Let us not forget that Callimachus' *Iambus* 1 and *Hymn* 1 are of little help here, for dating these works is debatable (see chapter I 1). The so far proposed dates for the publishing of Euhemerus' work are as follows:

- 311–298¹³
- the last decade of the 4th century ¹⁴
- 303–290¹⁵
- c. 300¹⁶
- 300–280¹⁷
- c. 290¹⁸
- c. 280¹⁹
- 280–270²⁰
- c. 270²¹
- 270–260²²
- after 270²³

Hellenistische Wundererzählungen (1906), 17; Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, *Der Glaube der Hellenen* (1932), II, 270; West, *Hesiod, Theogony* (1966), 13; Ogilvie, *The Library* (1978), 56; 'The Sacred Chronicle'/'die Heilige Chronik': Susemihl, *Geschichte* (1891), I, 317; Pöhlmann, *Geschichte* (1925), II, 293; Cole, *Democritus* (1967), 159; 'The Sacred Record'/'der Heilige Bericht': Gigon, *Die antike Kultur* (1971), 83; Fraser, *Ptolemaic Alexandria* (1972), I, 289; Henrichs, *The Sophists* (1984), 148; Bosworth, *Augustus* (1999), 10; 'The Sacred Narrative': Chaniotis, *The Divinity* (2003), 432; 'The Holy Account': Whitmarsh, *Prose Fiction* (2010), 398. 408; 'The Sacred Register': Stephens, *Seeing Double* (2003), 37; Acosta-Hughes, Stephens, *Callimachus* (2012), 13. 64.

13 Beard, North, Price, *Religions of Rome* (1998), II, 54.

14 Gigon, *Die antike Kultur* (1971), 83; Ogilvie, *The Library* (1978), 55 'towards the end of the fourth century'.

15 Tarn, *Alexander* (1933), 45–46.

16 Gabba, *True History* (1981), 58 'at the beginning of the third century B.C.'; Ribbeck, *Geschichte* (1894), 46; Dörrie, *Der Königs-kult* (1964), 219; Graf, *Greek Mythology* (1993), 192 'written not long after 300 B.C.'; Whitmarsh, *Prose Fiction* (2010), 408.

17 Rusten, *Dionysius Scytobrachion* (1982), 104.

18 Sieroka, *De Euhemero* (1869), 29; van Gils, *Quaestiones* (1902), 15; van der Meer, *Euhemerus* (1949), 12.

19 Jacoby, *Euhemerus* (1907), 953; Geffcken, *Euhemerism* (1912), 572; Bethe, *Die griechische Dichtung* (1924–1928), 318; Kern, *Die Religion* (1938), III, 119; Pfister, *Ein apokrypher Alexanderbrief* (1964), 295–296; Thraede, *Euhemerismus* (1966), 878; Fusillo, *Euhemerus* (1998), 236.

20 Bertelli, *Il modello* (1976), 200–201; Garlan, *Les sociétés* (1981), 136.

21 Valluari, *Evemero* (1956), 5.

22 Griset, *L'evemerismo* (1959), 65.

23 Otto, *Priester und Tempel* (1908), II, 274, n. 2.

Unfortunately, all of these dates are hypothetical and none of them can be convincingly justified.

4. Literary form

A. Ideal island²⁴

Euhemerus presented a society living on an island in the Indian Ocean, i.e. at the very edge of the contemporary world. In doing so he was following an old tradition. Already Homer mentioned the island of Syria, located far away in the West.²⁵ Later Plato (427–347) described Atlantis, and Hecataeus of Abdera the island of Helixioia, inhabited by the Hyperboreans.²⁶ Likewise Dionysius Scytobrachion (3rd century BC) and Iambulus described such islands.²⁷ It is worth noting that along with the broadening of geographical horizons, the location of these islands also changed. Homer located his islands in the Mediterranean Sea, Plato beyond the Pillars of Hercules in the

-
- 24 On utopian islands, see Fauth, *Utopische Inseln* (1979), 39–42; Gabba, *True History* (1981), 55–60; Lanczkowski, *Die Inseln der Seligen* (1986), esp. 51–63; Glaser, *Utopische Inseln* (1996), esp. 17–27 (Atlantis); Prontera, *Insel* (1998), 317–320; Lätsch, *Insularität und Gesellschaft* (2005), 225–227; See Vilatte, *L'insularité* (1989), 3–13; Vilatte, *L'insularité* (1991); Constantakopoulou, *The Dance of the Islands* (2007), 1–10, 163–175. On islands in oriental literature, see works cited by Fauth, *op. cit.*, 39, n. 2.
- 25 The Island of Syria: Od. XV 403–414. On Homeric islands, see e.g. Ghidini Tortorelli, *Miti e utopie* (1976/78), 10–37; Clay, *Goat Island* (1980), 261–264; Clay, *Aeolia* (1985), 289–291; Bichler, *Von der Insel* (1995), 19–39, 186–189. Ideal islands in ancient literature are listed by Winiarczyk, *Die hellenist. Utopien* (2011), 261–263. Already with Homer we have the concept of a pious and just people inhabiting the very edges of the world. These people are listed by Winiarczyk, *op. cit.*, 231–235. See e.g. Snowden, *Blacks* (1970), 144–150, 304–307; MacLachlan, *Feasting with Ethiopians* (1992), 15–33, esp. 28ff.; Romm, *The Edges* (1992), 49–60; Bichler, *Von der Insel* (1995), 16–18. Cf. Rosellini, Saïd, *Usages de femmes* (1978), 955–966; Moreau, *Peuples du bout* (1988), 109–122; Nesselrath, *Herodot* (1995), 20–44; Karttunen, *The Ethnography of the Fringes* (2002), 457–474.
- 26 Atlantis: Pl. *Crit.* 113 C –121 C; *Tim.* 24 D–25 D. See e.g. Dušanic, *Plato's Atlantis* (1982), 25–52; Bichler, *Athen besiegt Atlantis* (1986), 71–88; Vidal – Naquet, *Athens and Atlantis* (1986), 263–284; Nesselrath, *Platon und die Erfindung von Atlantis* (2002); Bichler, *Die Position von Atlantis* (2008), 89–103. Helixioia: Hecat. FGrHist 264 F 7 ap. Diod. II 47. On Hecataeus' *On the Hyperboreans*, see Winiarczyk, *Die hellenist. Utopien* (2011), 45–71.
- 27 The island of Hesperia on Lake Tritonis: Dionys. Scyt. F 2–3 Rusten ap. Diod. III 53, 4–6. An island on the river Triton: Dionys. Scyt. F 8 ap. Diod. III 68, 5–69, 4. The Island of the Sun in the Indian Ocean: Iambul. ap. Diod. II 55–60. On the work of Iambulus, see Winiarczyk, *Die hellenist. Utopien* (2011), 181–203.

Atlantic Ocean,²⁸ whereas Hecataeus placed his island far beyond the Rhipaeian Mountains. However, after Alexander the Great's expedition to India, the Greeks started becoming fascinated with the East.²⁹ These interests were deepened through the books of writers such as Onesicritus, Nearchus, Clitarchus and Megasthenes.³⁰ If a writer wished to attract a large readership, he would place his island or group of islands in the Indian Ocean. This is exactly what Euhemerus did. He even stressed that from the eastern coast of Panchaea one could see the mountains of India, i.e. the Himalayas.³¹ Iambulus also writes about a voyage from the Island of the Sun to India. The theme of utopian islands also appeared during the Roman Empire in Lucian's *Veræ historiae* (2nd century AD).³²

Some scholars³³ notice in Euhemerus' work the influence of ancient Egyptian literature because the 'Shipwrecked sailor' tale, which originates from the start of the 12th dynasty, i.e. the first half of the 20th century BC, describes the sea voyage of an Egyptian official. He was sent on a mission south by his king and by accident reached an island where there were many trees and bushes (including ones bearing frankincense and myrrh) as well as diverse animals. The ruler of the island was a giant snake whose body was covered with gold and whose eyebrows were of lapis lazuli. The snake gave the castaway many riches and allowed him to return to Egypt.³⁴

28 Likewise, other authors have located ideal islands in the Atlantic Ocean. See e.g. Schulten, *Die Inseln der Seligen* (1926), 229–247; Capelle, *Elysium und Inseln der Seligen* (1927), 245–264; Capelle, *Elysium* (1928), 17–40; Le Roux, *Le îles au Nord du Mond* (1962), 1051–1062; Schmitt, *Connaissance des Îles Canaries* (1968), 362–391; Molter, 'Glückliche Inseln' (1974), 315–325; Rebuffat, *Arva beata petamus* (1976), 877–891; Amiotti, *Le Isole Fortunate* (1988), 166–177; Manfredi, *Le Isole Fortunate* (1996); Borca, *Terra mari cincta* (2000), 53–69; Roller, *Through the Pillars* (2006), 44–50.

29 See Dihle, *Die Griechen und die Fremden* (1994), 54–66 ('Die Veränderung des griechischen Weltbildes durch den Alexanderzug').

30 FGrHist 133 (Nearchus); FGrHist 134 (Onesicritus); FGrHist 137 (Clitarchus); FGrHist 715 (Megasthenes).

31 Diod. V 42, 3 = T 31 θεωρεῖσθαι τὴν Ἰνδικὴν ἀέριον. See Tarn, *Alexander* (1933), 45–46; van der Meer, *Euhemerus* (1949), 39. Cf. Wesseling, *Diodori Siculi* (1798), III, 596 'ἀέριον omne immane et in aërem vastissime exsurgens'.

32 See e.g. Fauth, *Utopische Inseln* (1979), 42–58; Nesselrath, *Utopie – Parodie* (1993), 41–56; Rütten, *Phantasie und Lachkultur* (1997); Georgiadou, *Larmour, Lucian's Science Fiction Novel* (1998); Möllendorff, *Auf der Suche* (2000).

33 E.g. Reitzenstein, *Hellenistische Wunderzählungen* (1906), 17. It is worth noting that Griffiths, *Atlantis* (1985), 12, believed it possible that 'The Shipwrecked Sailor and stories like it ... may have influenced the element of simple Utopianism in Plato's Atlantis'.

34 See e.g. Erman, *Die Literatur der Ägypter* (1923), 56–63; Wainwright, *Zeberged* (1946), 31–38; Lanczkowski, *Die Geschichte des Schiffbrüchigen* (1953), 360–371; *idem*, *Parallelmotive* (1955), 239–260; Goedicke, *Die Geschichte des Schiffbrüchigen* (1974), who corrects previous translations and interprets the text differently to

Nevertheless, to me this hypothesis, put forward by Richard Reitzenstein (1861–1931), is quite improbable, because Euhemerus was referring to a well-established theme in Greek literature and had no need to model his work on an Egyptian tale.

Most ancient geographers and historians considered the discovery of Panchaea to be fictitious, only Diodorus unreservedly accepted the story of Euhemerus' voyage and discovery of a group of islands in the Indian Ocean to be true (see chapter I 4 a). Scholars in modern times have been even more naïve in their attempts to identify Panchaea as one of the then known islands. The most frequent candidates included the island of Socotra, sometimes Ceylon or the small island of Kishm in the Persian Gulf.³⁵ All attempts to identify Panchaea are quite futile as this island is clearly a piece of literary fiction.

B. *Locus amoenus*

One may discern clear similarities in the descriptions of nature of various utopian islands. For a long time this was explained by the idea that successive authors were inspired by their predecessors and therefore the question was asked as to who the original author was. It was not until 1948 that Ernst Robert Curtius (1886–1956) put forward the hypothesis of the existence of a literary convention including a basic repertoire of themes used in poetry and prose from Homer's age right up to the time of the Roman Empire. He proposed that this convention should be called *locus amoenus*. This definition has been accepted by scholars and since then many works have appeared concerning particular elements of *locus amoenus* and the way in which this convention was used.³⁶ Many species of trees and bushes grow on Panchaea, including cypresses, plane trees, laurels, myrrh, date palms and hazel. There are also grapevines and meadows covered with flowers. The island is also inhabited by beautifully coloured singing birds, elephants, lions, panthers and antelopes. Moreover, there are sources and rivers. Let us

earlier scholars (e.g. in pp. 31–32 the snake is not covered with real gold or lapis lazuli); Simpson, *Schiffbrüchiger* (1984), 619–622; Lanczkowski, *Die Inseln* (1986), 20–22.

35 a) Socotra (Διοσκουρίδου νῆσος): Glaser, *Punt* (1899), 43; Glaser, *Das Weihrauchland* (1899), 4; Hommel, *Die Insel der Seligen* (1901), 21–22; Tkač, *Saba* (1920), 1404; Hommel, *Ethnologie* (1926), 15 with n. 2. b) Ceylon (= Taprobane): Blochet, *De l'autonomie* (1934), 165. c) Kishm: Hüsing, *Panchaia* (1929), 102 ff. d) island of Bangāla, Bengalen: Brunnhofer, *Vom Aral bis zur Gangā* (1892), 70–93.

36 See e.g. Schönbeck, *Der locus amoenus* (1962); Elliger, *Die Darstellung der Landschaft* (1975); Lincoln, *On the Imagery of Paradise* (1980), 151–164; Thesleff, *Man and locus amoenus* (1981), 31–45; Thesleff, *Notes on the Paradise Myth* (1986), 129–139; Haß, *Der locus amoenus* (1998).

add that the *locus amoenus* convention was used to describe not only utopian islands but also the land of the dead (the Blessed Isles and Elysium) as well as the Golden Age.³⁷ That is why I believe it wrong to try and search for the sources of Euhemerus' description of Panchaeian nature.

Of course I am not suggesting the Euhemerus did not know Homer's epics or Plato's dialogues. It is almost certain he did, like all other educated Greeks. No doubt, he also knew the books of Onesicritus, Nearchus and Megasthenes, describing lands encountered during Alexander the Great's expedition.³⁸ In a commentary to my edition of Euhemerus I have matched parallel places, but it seems to me that these parallels should be treated as interesting *similia* or literary reminiscences rather than as evidence of a direct link between Euhemerus and earlier authors.³⁹

C. Utopian novel

Under the influence of Erwin Rohde (1845–1898), Euhemerus' work started being called a utopian travel novel or simply a travel novel.⁴⁰ Recently Nik-

37 Gernet, *La cité future* (1933), 293–310.

38 Bosworth, *The Historical Setting* (1996), 113–127, put forward a theory according to which Megasthenes was an emissary in approximately the year 319/318 and his description was of India in the transition period between the Alexander the Great expedition and the founding of Chandragupta state. This view has been accepted by Schepens, *Probleme der Fragmentation* (2000), 14–15, but rejected by Wiemer, *Held, Gott* (2011), 201, n. 98 and Zambrini, *Alessandro in India* (2011), 63, n. 30. Other scholars have taken a more cautious stance, e.g. Koulakiotis, *Genese und Metamorphose des Alexandermythos* (2006), 126–127 and Parker, *The Making of Roman India* (2008), p. 42 with n. 140.

39 See chapter IV 4 (Euhemerus' sources).

40 Rohde, *Der gr. Roman* (1914), 237 'utopischer Roman'; Thraede, *Euhemerismus* (1966), 878 'ein utopisch-philosophischer Roman einer Reisebeschreibung'; Aalders, *Political Thought* (1975), 68 'fictitious traveller's tale'; Zumschlinge, *Euhemerios* (1976), 240 'Genos der Reiseliteratur'; Hägg, *The Novel* (1983), 117–118 'fantastic travel tales'; Bichler, *Zur historischen Beurteilung* (1984), 187 'Reiseerzählung'; Reardon, *The Form of Greek Romance* (1991), 5 'Hellenistic utopian travel stories (Iambulus, Euhemerus)'; Fuchs, *Pseudologia* (1993), 202; Nesselrath, *Utopie-Parodie* (1993), 44 'utopischer Reiseroman'; Kuch, *A Study on the Margin of the Ancient Novel* (2003), 210 'the utopian adventure novels'; Romm, *Travel* (2008), 125 'the proto-novelistic traveller's tales of Iambulus and Euhemerus'. On the fictitious journey, see Gove, *The Imaginary Voyage* (1941), esp. 3–27, 154–178; Romm, *op. cit.* 109–126. Fauth, *Utopische Inseln* (1979), 40–41, is right to note that 'voyage imaginaire ... resultiert aus drei miteinander zusammenhängenden psychologischen Motiven: erstens aus der menschlichen Neugier, dem Entdeckungs- und Wissensdrang mit seinem Bedürfnis nach Erweiterung der Weltansicht unter Überschreitung scheinbar unüberwindlicher, von der Natur gesetzter Grenzen; zweitens aus der Lust am Abenteuer, aus dem Reiz der Gefahr in der Begegnung mit dem Unbekannten und Unvorhersehbaren; drittens aus der Sehnsucht nach dem Neuen, das heißt dem

las Holzberg expressed doubts as to whether Euhemerus' book may really be called a travel novel.⁴¹ Although the voyage description does not play as important a role in extant testimonia as in the case of Iambulus' work (Diod. II 55–60), the Ἱερὰ Ἀναγραφή nonetheless does constitute an account of Euhemerus' voyage as well as the many journeys of Zeus. Calling it a 'utopian novel' seems appropriate, because already Apollodorus of Athens compared Panchaea with Theopompus' Μερσις γῆ and Hecataeus of Abdera's Κιμμερίς πόλις.⁴² Nevertheless, we should remember that here we are speaking of utopia *sensu lato* and not *sensu stricto* (i.e. *Staatsroman*).⁴³ The utopian themes (e.g. the lack of private ownership or the fair distribution of grain and livestock) are of secondary importance, while the description of Panchaea provides merely a background setting for the presentation of the origins of religion.

Although Euhemerus used the form of a travel novel, the objective was not for his tale to be treated as a work of fiction. He must have wanted readers to believe his account of discovering a stele on the island of Panchaea. Hecataeus of Abdera and Iambulus also desired credibility.⁴⁴ Moreover, there can be no doubt that Euhemerus wanted the stele's presentation of the Panchaeian rulers' *res gestae* to be accepted as true. However, I do not think the above statements support the hypothesis of Sylvia Honigman that the Ἱερὰ Ἀναγραφή was a type of historiography.⁴⁵ Indeed, the author herself

Schöneren und Besseren, aus dem Verlangen nach dem Überfluß, dem mühe-losem Zuhandensein aller Dinge in einer idealen Umgebung.' On fiction in Homer, see Hölscher, *Die Odyssee* (1988), 210–234, 341–343.

- 41 Holzberg, *Novel-like Works* (2003), 626 'The Sacred Inscription' may ... quite legitimately be seen as a forerunner of the utopian novel, but to link it in addition to the travel novel would be stretching the available facts.'
- 42 Apollod. 244 F 157 a = Euhem. T 6 = Theopomp. 115 F 75 c = Hecat. 264 F 8. The reservations of Fusillo, *Euhemerus* (1998), 235–236 do not seem justified. It is debatable as to whether Apollodorus relied on Eratosthenes. This view was accepted by Jacoby, *Hekataios* (1912), 2755 (differently in: *FGrHist IIIa* [1943], 52 'nach Eratosthenes in der *Geschichte der Geographie*?'); Fraser, *Ptol. Alexandria* (1972), I, 293; II, 454–455 n. 830 and Aalders, *Die Meropes* (1978), 323, n. 30; Geus, *Eratosthenes* (2002), 268, n. 42 ('wir also berechtigt sind, den Text mittelbar auf Eratosthenes zurückzuführen'). A different view is held by Rusten, *Dionysius Scytobrachion* (1982), 113–114.
- 43 See Winiarczyk, *Die hellenist. Utopien* (2011), 4–12.
- 44 On Hecataeus and Iambulus, see Winiarczyk, *op. cit.*, 45–71 and 181–203. Also see Bichler, *An den Grenzen zur Phantastik* (2006), 242–246. On the problem of fiction in the ancient world see e.g. Rösler, *Die Entdeckung der Fiktionalität* (1980), 283–319; Feeney, *Towards an Account* (1993), 230–244; Schirren, *Philosophos Bios* (2005), 15–37; Morgan, *Fiction and History* (2007), 553–564; Whitmarsh, *Prose Fiction* (2010), 395–411.
- 45 Honigman, *Euhemerus* (2009), 5–9, cf. p. 2 'Euhemerus conceived his work as historiography'. However, Honigman fails to specify what type of historiography the Ἱερὰ Ἀναγραφή was. See n. 46.

admits that Euhemerus' book had 'the form of the travelogue genre', which she considers 'a concession to contemporary fashion' (p. 30). She is also aware that in ancient literature islands served to present various strange or even quite fantastic phenomena. For these reasons it seems more probable to me that Euhemerus' work was a utopian travel novel. Nevertheless, we should remember that it was such a novel *sensu lato*, something like a fringe novel, because this literary genre really appeared much later in antiquity.⁴⁶

5. Applied method

In the Ἰεπὰ Ἀναγραφή Euhemerus uses the first-person narrative, which 'lends a certain credibility to the incredible things described by the author'.⁴⁷

The main part of the work most probably concerned the deeds of Uranus, Cronus and Zeus, as described by the last of these on a golden stele in the temple of Zeus Triphylian on the island of Panchaea (see chapter V 4). Euhemerus presented an original politico-religious theogony that referred to the traditional theogonic poetry style.⁴⁸ In the Sophistic spirit, the author first recounted a history of culture according to which human life was initially primitive and similar to that of animals.⁴⁹ It was Zeus who

46 Novels of this sort did not appear in the strict sense until the 1st century AD and declined towards the end of the Second Sophistic in the second half of the 3rd century AD, when Greek society underwent fundamental changes. See e.g. Swain, *Hellenism* (1996), 101–131, 423–425 ('The Dating of the Greek Novels'); Holzberg, *Der antike Roman* (2006), 23–25, 38–39. It should be added that various ancient literary forms are much debated. See e.g. Treu, *Roman und Geschichtsschreibung* (1984), 456–459; Marincola, *Genre, Convention* (1999), 281–324; Pelling, *Genre and Meaning* (1999), 325–335 (including their extensive bibliographies).

47 Ruiz-Montero, *The Rise of the Greek Novel* (2003), 39. See Werner, *Zum ΛΟΥΚΙΟΣ Η ΟΝΟΣ* (1918), 242–249; Forstreuter, *Die deutsche Icherzählung*. (1924), 3–6 (ancient *Ich-Erzählungen*); Söder, *Die apokryphen Apostelgeschichten* (1932), 211–215; Romberg, *Studies in the Narrative Technique* (1962); Scobie, *Aspects of the Ancient Romance* (1969), 42–43; Suerbaum, *Die Ich-Erzählungen* (1968), 150–177; Speyer, *Die literarische Fälschung* (1971), 50–56. Also see Misch, *Geschichte der Autobiographie* (1949), I 1, 49–62. It is worth adding that ancient writers attached great importance to autopsy. They frequently referred to what they themselves had seen, heard or directly witnessed. Autopsy was a means of making their narrative more plausible. See e.g. Nenci, *Il motivo dell'autopsia* (1953), 14–46; Scobie, *Storytellers* (1979), 244; Schepens, *L'Autopsie* (1980), esp. 1–3, 14–32; Marincola, *Authority and Tradition* (1997), esp. 63–86 ('Eyes, ears and contemporary history').

48 Thraede, *Euhemerismus* (1966), 879. See West, *Hesiod, Theogony* (1966), 13 'The Sacred History of Euhemerus ... may be called the last true Greek theogony, though it is a theogony without gods.'

49 According to Nilsson, *Geschichte* (1988), II, 287. It is, however, doubtful as to whether Euhemerus wrote that humans were initially born out of the earth (cf. *Etym. Mag.* s.v. Βποτός = T 78), as has been assumed by Sieroka, *De Euhemero* (1869),

finally put an end to this unruly way of life (ἄτακτος βίος) and forbade cannibalism.⁵⁰ He gave people laws to follow and thus introduced civilized customs.⁵¹ Moreover, he supported the inventions of other people.⁵² Likewise other gods were inventors (εὑρεταί) and benefactors (εὐεργέται), for instance Aphrodite invented astronomy and introduced prostitution.⁵³ Zeus circumnavigated the oikoumene five times⁵⁴ and granted the rule of different countries to his friends and relatives.⁵⁵ Zeus' journeys allowed the author to describe various countries and draw the reader's attention to their historic buildings as well as other peculiar features. Euhemerus wrote about: Babylonia,⁵⁶ Syria and Cilicia,⁵⁷ Egypt and the pyramids,⁵⁸ Arabia

13 and Némethy, *Euhemeri reliquiae* (1889), 31–32. This view was rejected by de Block, *Évhémère* (1876), 42, n. 1.

- 50 Sext. Emp. *Adv. math.* IX 17 = T 27; Lact. *Div. inst.* I 13, 2 = T 66. Cannibalism was also prohibited by Isis and Osiris: Hecat. (FGrHist 264 F 25) ap. Diod. I 14, 1; *Aret. Isid.* 21 ἐγὼ μετὰ τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ Ὀσίριδος τὰς ἀνθρωποφαγίας ἔπαυσα; Κόρη Κόσμου 2 (Corp. Herm. IV 21 Nock) ap. Stob. I 49, 44 (I 406 Wachsmuth) οὗτοι τὸ τῆς ἀλλοφρονίας ἔπαυσαν ἄγριον. See Peek, *Der Isishymnos* (1930), 46–50; Haussleiter, *Der Vegetarismus* (1935), 71 with n. 1; Harder, *Karpokrates* (1944), 28–32; Festugière, *À propos des aréologies* (1949), 216–220, reprint in idem, *Études* (1972), 145–149; Müller, *Ägypten* (1961), 48–49; Bergman, *Ich bin Isis* (1968), 212–215; O'Brien, *Xenophanes, Aeschylus* (1985), 273–275; Bees, *Zenons Politeia* (2011), 174–206.
- 51 Lact. *Div. inst.* I 11, 45 = T 69 A 'reliquitque hominibus leges mores frumentaque paravit multaue alia bona fecit.' Uranus proceeded similarly in: Dion. Scyt. (FGrHist 32 F 7 = fr. 6 Rusten) ap. Diod. III 56, 3; Cronus in: Diod. V 66, 4; Isis in: *Aret. Isid.* 4 p. 2 Totti; Dionysus in: Megasth. (FGrHist 715 F 12) ap. Arrian. *Ind.* 7, 5 sqq. See Sartori, *Storia* (1984), 494–498; Sulimani, *Diodorus' Mythistory* (2011), 230–280. On benefactor rulers, see chapter III 2 B, n. 122.
- 52 Lact. *Div. inst.* I 11, 35 = T 67 'item si quis quid novi invenerat quod ad vitam humanam utile esset, eo veniebant atque Iovi ostendebant.' See Pl. *Phaedr.* 274 DE (Teuth – Thamus); Hecat. (FGrHist 264 F 25) ap. Diod. I 15, 9–16, 2 (Hermes – Osiris); Leon (FGrHist 659 F 9a) ap. Hyg. *De astr.* II 20 (Ammon – Liber).
- 53 Hyg. *De astr.* II 42, 5 = T 74; Lact. *Div. inst.* I 17, 9–10 = T 75 A 'artem meretriciam instituit'.
- 54 On the significance of the number 5 to Latin authors, see Birt, *Die Fünffzahl* (1915), 253–259 (p. 259 'Die Fünffzahl bedeutet hier die unangemessene Vielheit').
- 55 Lact. *Div. inst.* I 11, 45 = T 69 A 'omnibusque amicis atque cognatis suis imperia divisit'.
- 56 Diod. VI 1, 10 = T 61.
- 57 Diod. VI 1, 10 = T 63.
- 58 Plin. *Nat. hist.* XXXVI 79 = T 80. Already Krahner, *Grundlinien* (1837), 30, rightly explained why Euhemerus wrote about the pyramids by referring to Cl. Al. *Protr.* IV 49, 3 καθάπερ δέ, οἶμαι, οἱ ναοί, οὕτω δὴ καὶ οἱ τάφοι θαυμάζονται, πυράμιδες καὶ μανυσώλεια καὶ λαβύρινθοι, ἄλλοι ναοὶ τῶν νεκρῶν, ὥς ἐκεῖνοι τάφοι τῶν θεῶν. The Ἱερὰ Ἀναγραφὴ refers to Ammon, who expelled the Doians from Panchaea (Diod. V 44, 6–7 = T 34). van Gils, *Quaestiones* (1902), 39 and Zumschlinge, *Euhemerus* (1976), 45–46, identified him with Zeus Ammon. A different opinion was held by: Vallauri, *Evemero* (1956), 52. Némethy, *Euhemeri reliquiae* (1889), 35; Ogilvie, *The Library* (1978), 56 and Henrichs, *The Sophists* (1984), 153, in reference to the

Felix,⁵⁹ the Palestine and the Jews,⁶⁰ Phoenicia,⁶¹ Caria and Rhodes,⁶² Crete⁶³ and Cyprus.⁶⁴ Euhemerus used aetiology and etymology to explain the names and epithets of gods. For example, Zeus was called *Aigiochus* because he had raped Aix, the wife of Pan, and had with her a son, Aigipan.⁶⁵ Aphrodite was called Urania on account of her invention of astronomy.⁶⁶ Uranus received his name for being the first to pay tribute to the heavenly gods.⁶⁷ The cult epithets of Zeus resulted from the alliances he made with

testimony of Minucius Felix (*Oct.* 21, 1 = T 9), believed that Euhemerus wrote about the goddess Isis. Others, however, have rejected such an interpretation of the testimony: van der Meer, *Euhemerus* (1949), 109; Vallauri, *op.cit.*, 48–49.

59 Diod. V 41, 2–3 = T 29.

60 Ios. *C. Ap.* I 215–217 = T 79 A. Willrich, *Juden und Griechen* (1895), 52 assumed that Euhemerus wrote about Iuppiter Sabazius (cf. Val. Max. I 3, 3), a view which was rejected by Stern, *Greek and Latin Authors on Jews* (1974), 53, n. 3. On Iuppiter Sabazius, see Cook, *Zeus* (1914), I, 390–403; Schwabl, *Zeus* (1972), 356–357; Hengel, *Judentum und Hellenismus* (1988), 478–480. Euhemerus was one of the first Greek authors to write about Jews. He was only preceded by: Hecat. Abd. (FGrHist 264 F 6) ap. Diod. XL 3; Theophr. *De piet.* (T 584 A Fortenbaugh = fr. 13 Pötscher) ap. Porph. *De abst.* II 26, 1; Megasth. (FGrHist 715 F 8) ap. Cl. Al. *Strom.* I 15, 72, 5; Clearch. *De somno* (fr. 6 Wehrli) ap. Ios. *C. Ap.* I 176–182. See Jaeger, *Diokles* (1938), 134–153; *idem*, *Greeks and Jews* (1938), 127–143, reprint in *idem*, *Scripta Minora* (1960), II, 169–183; Stern, *The Jews* (1976), 1101–1159; Hengel, *Judentum* (1988), 464–473; Baltrusch, *Bewunderung* (1998), 403–421; Bloch, *Antike Vorstellungen vom Judentum* (2002), 27–63. There is debate as to whether Hecataeus (according to most scholars) or Theophrastus (according to Stern) was the first Greek author to write about Jews. See Stern, Murray, *Hecataeus* (1973), 159–168. The above cited texts were published by Stern, *Greek and Latin Authors on Jews* (1974).

61 Athen. XIV 77, 658 EF = T 77.

62 Lact. *Div. inst.* I 22, 23 = T 64 A.

63 Lact. *Div. inst.* I 14, 10 = T 56; I 11, 46 = T 69 A.

64 Lact. *Div. inst.* I 17, 9–10 = T 75 A.

65 Hyg. *De astr.* II 13, 4 = T 68.

66 Hyg. *De astr.* II 42, 5 = T 74 ‘Euhemerus autem Venerem primam ait sidera constituisset et Mercurio demonstrasse’. Scholars (Némethy, *Euhemerii reliquiae* [1889], 12, 34; van der Meer, *Euhemerus* [1949], 71; Vallauri, *Evemero* [1956], 54), rightly believe that this way Euhemerus wanted to explain the epithet ‘Urania’ (cf. Pl. *Symp.* 180 DE; Xen. *Symp.* VIII 9). On the cult of Aphrodite Urania in Alexarchus’ Uranopolis and its supposed connection with Euhemerus’ work, see Winiarczyk, *Die hellenist. Utopien* (2011), 209–215.

67 Diod. VI 1, 8 = T 49 διὸ καὶ Οὐρανὸν προσαγορευθῆναι. However, a more probable interpretation seems to be provided by Lact. *Div. inst.* I, 11, 63 (T 62), ‘de sui avi nomine caelum nomen indidit (scil. Iuppiter)’. Lactantius’ interpretation was accepted by: Sieroka, *De Evemero* (1869), 10; Hirzel, *Der Dialog* (1895), I, 395, n. 3; Langer, *Euhemerus* (1926), 56–59; Spoerri, *Späthellenistische Berichte* (1959), 191–192; Thraede, *Euhemerismus* (1966), 878; Cole, *Democritus* (1967), 202, n. 2. See Dion. Scyt. (FGrHist 32 F 7 = fr. 6 Rusten) ap. Diod. III 56, 5 μεταγαγεῖν δ’ αὐτοῦ (scil. Οὐρανοῦ) τὴν προσηγορίαν ἐπὶ τὸν κόσμον and Philo (FGrHist 790 F 2) ap. Eus. *Praep. ev.* I 10, 15 ὡς ἂν αὐτοῦ (scil. Οὐρανοῦ) καὶ τὸ ὑπὲρ ἡμᾶς

local rulers (e.g. Ataburius, Casius, Labrayndus).⁶⁸ Moreover, Euhemerus created the names of kings out of the names of countries and mountains, e.g. Cilix after Cilicia and Casius after Κάσιον ὄρος.⁶⁹ The attractiveness of the work was most probably enhanced thanks to its descriptions of the καταστερισμός, i.e. placing among the stars,⁷⁰ as well as the use of proverbs.⁷¹ Euhemerus presented not only the Olympian gods but also the heroes. His account of Cadmus is quite frivolous: he describes him as the king of Sidon's cook who escaped with the royal flautist Harmonia.⁷²

στοιχεῖον δι' ὑπερβολὴν τοῦ κάλλους ὀνομάζειν οὐρανόν Cf. Diod. III 57, 5; 60, 3. A different view is held by Block, *Évhémère* (1876), 36–37, n. 0; Némethy, *Euhemeri reliquiae* (1889), 25; Jacoby, *Euemeros* (1907), 957. 969, who referred to Diod. I 13, 2 and *Orac. Sib.* III 111–112. Cf. Jacoby, *op. cit.*, 957 'διὸ καὶ οὐρανὸς προσαγορεύθη kann verschieden gefaßt werden, je nachdem man Οὐρανὸς oder οὐρανός liest.'

- 68 Lact. *Div. inst.* I 22, 23 (T 64 A). **Iuppiter Ataburius** (Ἀταβύριος) was worshipped on the island of Rhodes (Pind. *Olymp.* 7, 87; Diod. V 59, 2; Str. XIV 2, 12 p. 655; Ps.-Apollod. *Bibl.* III 2, 1; Appian. *Mithrid.* 26; Steph. Byz. s.v. Ἀτάβυρον et Κρητηνία and in Acragas (Polyb. IX 27, 7). See Cook, *Zeus* (1925), II, 922–925; Eißfeldt, *Der Gott des Tabor* (1934), 15–22; Morelli, *I culti in Rodi* (1959), 46–49, 138–141; Schwabl, *Zeus* (1972), 283; Schwabl, *Zeus* (1978), 1445; Vonderstein, *Der Zeuskult* (2006), 172–175; Kreutz, *Zeus* (2007), 28–30. De Angelis, Garstad, *Euhemerus* (2006), 228, consider it possible but 'not proven' that a Zeus Ataburius cult was introduced to the Lipari islands via Corcyra or Acragas, or alternatively directly from Rhodes. **Iuppiter Casius** was worshipped, among other places, in: a) Κάσιον ὄρος in Syria: Iul. *Misop.* 361 D; Lib. *Or.* 18, 172 (II 310–311 Foerster); Ammian. Marc. XXII 14, 4; *Anth. Pal.* VI 332; Suda s.v. Κάσιον ὄρος, b) na Κάσιον ὄρος near Pelusium in Egypt: Str. XVI 2, 33 p. 760; Plin. *Nat. hist.* V 68; Ios. *Bel. Iud.* IV 661; Achil. Tat. III 6; Sext. Emp. *Pyrhrh. hyp.* III 224; Solin. 34, 1; Steph. Byz. s.v. Κάσιον, c) in Cassiopeia on Corcyra: Plin. *Nat. hist.* IV 52; Suet. *Nero* 22, 3; Procop. *De bell. Goth.* VIII 22, 25–26. See Adler, *Kasios* (1919), 2265–2267; Steuernagel-Kees, Κάσιον ὄρος (1919), 2263–2264; Salač, ZEYΣ ΚΑΣΙΟΣ (1922), 160–189; Cook, *Zeus* (1925), II, 981–987; Eißfeldt, *Baal Zaphon* (1932), 30–48; Eißfeldt, *Der Gott* (1934), 29–38; Zuntz, *On the Etymology* (1951), esp. 25 ff; Schwabl, *Zeus* (1972), 320–321; Schwabl, *Zeus* (1978), 1459–1460; Chuvin, Yoyotte, *Documents relatives au culte de Zeus Casios* (1986), 41–63; Fauth, *Das Kasion-Gebirge* (1990), 105–118; Koch, *Ḥazzi – Šafōn – Kasion* (1993), 171 – 223, esp. 212 ff.; Vonderstein, *Der Zeuskult* (2006), 154. **Iuppiter Labrayndius** (Λαβράυνδος) was worshipped in Caria (especially in Mylasa): Str. XIV 2, 25 p. 659; Plin. *Nat. hist.* XXXII 16; Plut. *Aetia Graeca* 45, 301 F; Ael. *Nat. an.* XII 30. See Ganszyniec, *Labraundos* (1924), 277–282; Cook, *Zeus* (1925), II, 559–599, esp. 585 ff.; Schwabl, *Zeus* (1972), 328–329; Schwabl, *Zeus* (1978), 1462–1463; Kreutz, *Zeus* (2007), 135–145.

- 69 Diod. VI 1, 10 = T 63. See n. 68.

- 70 Hyg. *De astr.* II 13, 4 = T 68 'qui, quod eam (scil. Aega) diligebat plurimum, inter astra figuram memoriae causae conlocovit.' On the καταστερισμός see Buraselis, *Apotheose* (2004), 161.

- 71 Diog. *Prov.* II 67 = T 76 (CPG I 207).

- 72 Athen. XIV 77, 658 EF = T 77.

Klaus E. Müller believed the popularity of the *Ἱερὰ Ἀναγραφή* resulted from its literary power of persuasion, thorough discussion of the subject, reference to an ancient document and logical method of reasoning.⁷³

73 Müller, *Geschichte* (1972), I, 267–268, ‘Sein Erfolg ... wird daher wohl eher in der literarischen Überzeugungskraft, mit welcher er schrieb, seiner Akribie bei der Behandlung des Stoffs, dessen scheinbar unanfechtbarer Beurkundung sowie der vermeintlicher Schlüssigkeit seiner Gedankenführung zu suchen sein.’

III. The theological views of Euhemerus of Messene

1. The reliability of Diodorus' account of the *theologia dipertita* in Euhemerus' Ἱερὰ Ἀναγραφή

Some scholars have questioned the reliability of Diodorus' account of Euhemerus' theological views.¹ The passage was not passed on to us directly but through the *Praeparatio evangelica* by Eusebius of Caesarea (died c. 340 AD).² According to it, Euhemerus was to recognise two types of gods: a) eternal and indestructible gods (αἰδίοι καὶ ἄφθαρτοι θεοί), such as the sun, moon, stars and wind, and, b) earthly gods (ἐπίγειοι θεοί), meaning people who achieved immortal fame and glory, such as Heracles, Dionysus and Aristaeus. One has to admit that this text may indeed arouse serious doubts, because Diodorus attributes the same view to be held by the inhabitants of Egypt and Ethiopia, who even used similar expressions.³ Kenneth S. Sacks notes that in books I–VI Diodorus almost 70 times mentions people who were deified for their services to humankind. That is why he believes the historian had altered his sources to express his own conviction that benefactions (εὐεργεσία) led to deification.⁴ Nevertheless, to me Sacks' view seems contentious. Although Diodorus willingly uses stereotypical expressions, passage VI 1, 8–9 (T 49) does speak of Uranus being learned in the movement of the stars and the first to pay homage to the heavenly gods, which would support the *theologia dipertita* thesis. Some scholars have maintained that this passage had also been altered by Diodorus,⁵ but such an approach raises important methodological reservations. After all, one cannot arbitrar-

1 Diod. VI 1, 1–2 = T 25. Hirzel, *Der Dialog* (1895), 395, n. 3; Langer, *Euhemerios* (1926), 56–59; Spoerri, *Späthellenistische Berichte* (1959), 190–193; Thraede, *Euhemerismus* (1966), 878. 880; Fraser, *Ptol. Alexandria* (1972), I, 291; Dochhorn, *Vegetationskult* (2001), 421, n. 46.

2 See Bounoure, *Eusèbe citateur de Diodore* (1982), 433–439.

3 Diod. I, 12, 10–I 13, 1 (Egypt); III 9, 1 (Ethiopia). See my commentary to Euhem. T 25.

4 Sacks, *Diodorus* (1990), 70 – 72. His view was accepted by Müller, *Überlegungen* (1993), 282.

5 See n. 1 above. Although generally scholars no longer consider Diodorus to have been a mindless compiler faithfully citing his sources and concede that he also expressed his own philosophical and political views, this does not allow us to question Diodorus' text in every respect. For more on this new approach to the *Bibliotheca historica*, see chapter II 1, n. 2 and 3.

ily question the credibility of a given text simply because it does not conform to a preconceived idea. In my opinion Euhemerus did not make a clear distinction between earthly and heavenly gods, but his work did mention Uranus laying offerings to heavenly gods, the deification of Uranus by Zeus and Zeus' self-deification.⁶ That is why Diodorus came to the conclusion that Euhemerus accepted the existence of two types of gods and expressed this view using his favourite, stereotypical phrases. One cannot rule out that also the names of other deified persons (Heracles, Dionysus and Aristaeus) were added by Diodorus, because the *homines pro diis culti* lists were created by the Stoic school only in the 3rd century BC.⁷ My hypothesis defends Diodorus' text and explains why he considered Euhemerus to be a supporter of the *theologia dipertita*.

2. Sources regarding Euhemerus' theological views

Euhemerus did not create a religious theory. What is more, he was not being original because he referred to previously known views.⁸ Below I discuss Euhemerus' assumed and alleged 'sources'.

-
- 6 Many scholars correctly assume that Euhemerus wrote about Uranus' deification after death and Zeus' self-deification. E.g. Jacoby, *Euemerios* (1907), 964–965; Valauri, *Origine* (1960), 15–16; Müller, *Geschichte* (1972), 267. Only Schwartz, *Hekataeos* (1885), 260, maintained that the 'Ἰερὰ Ἀναγραφὴ speaks exclusively about self-deification. A.D. Nock, review van der Meer, *CW* 44, 1950, 89, is wrong to believe Zeus' apotheosis occurred after his death as an act of gratitude. The grounds for Zeus' self-deification was his rule over the oikoumene and euergetism. See Lact. *Div. inst.* I 22, 26 = T 64 A 'hoc modo religionem cultus sui per orbem terrae Iuppiter seminavit et exemplum ceteris ad imitandum dedit'. Müller, *Überlegungen* (1993), 280–281, overemphasises Zeus' power. For more on the benefits he bestowed on people, see Lact. *Div. inst.* I 13, 2 = T 66 'verum primum Iovem leges hominibus moresque condentem edicto prohibuisse, ne liceret eo cibo (scil. humana carne) vesci'; Lact. *ibid.* I 11, 35 = T 67 'ad eum (scil. Iovem) in ius veniebant, si quae res in controversia erant. Item si quis quid novi invenerat quod ad vitam humanam utile esset, eo veniebant atque Iovi ostendebant'; Lact. *ibid.* I 11, 45 = T 69 A 'hominibus leges mores frumenta paravit multaque alia bona fecit, immortalis gloria memoriae adfectus sempiterna monumenta sui reliquit'. See my commentary to Euhem. T 66.
 - 7 Winiarczyk, *Wykazy 'homines pro diis culti'* (1999), 75–80. Also see Elter, *Donarem pateras* (1907), 40, 7–40, 9; Geffcken, *Zwei griechische Apologeten* ((1907), 225–226; Cerfaux, Tondraux, *Un concurrent* (1957), 457–459; La Penna, *Brevi considerazioni* (1988), 275–287.
 - 8 See e.g. Susemihl, *Geschichte* (1891), I, 320; Decharme, *La critique* (1904), 372–374; Wendland, *Die hellenistisch-römische Kultur* (1912), 120; Brown, *Euhemerus and the Historians* (1946), 259, 264; Taeger, *Charisma* (1957), I, 396; Nilsson, *Geschichte* (1988), II, 287.

A. Old Greek concepts

a. The hero cult

Among Greeks there was a widespread conviction that some of the heroes became gods. The best known of these included Asclepius, Heracles and the Dioscuri. The *homines pro diis culti* lists⁹ include other heroes, such as Achilles, Alabandus, Amphiarus, Helena, Ino, Melicertes/Palaemon, Tennes and Tyndareus. Let us take a closer look at the deification of Heracles and Asclepius.

On account of his death on a pyre on Mount Oita, near Trachis, Heracles joined the Olympian gods¹⁰ and married Hebe, the daughter of Hera. There is no consensus as when this myth first emerged. Although the apotheosis of Heracles is already mentioned in the *Odyssey*¹¹ as well as in the works of Hesiod,¹² already in ancient times these verses were regarded as interpolations,¹³ no doubt on account of the fact that the *Iliad* only very generally refers to the death of Heracles.¹⁴ Therefore the first literary testimonies date back to the 6th century BC, although in vase paintings the apotheosis myth appears no earlier than in the 7th century BC. A crater found on the island of Samos depicts Heracles and Hebe on a cart, accompanied by other gods.¹⁵ A similar scene appears on a Corinthian aryballos from the 6th century BC.¹⁶ I presume that the myth emerged in the second half of the 7th century and initially had nothing to do with Heracles' death on a pyre. It was

9 The *homines pro diis culti* lists are in Appendix I.

10 See Nilsson, *Der Flammentod des Herakles* (1922), 310–316, reprint in *idem, Opuscula selecta* (1951), 348–354; Stoessl, *Der Tod des Herakles* (1945); Burkert, *Griechische Religion* (2011), 321 (oriental parallels concerning deification through fire). Demeter put into the fire Demophon (*Hymn. Hom. in Cer.* 239 ff.) and Triptolemus (*Hyg. Fab.* 147; *Serv. Verg. Georg.* I 19 [III 1, 136 Thilo]; *Myth. Vat.* II 119 [CCL 91 C, 187]). Thetis proceeded similarly with Achilles (*Apoll. Rhod.* IV 869–879; *Ps.-Apollod. Bibl.* III 13, 6) as did Isis with the son of the king of Byblos (*Plut. De Is. et Os.* 15, 357 A–C). See Halm-Tisserant, *Cannibalisme et immortalité* (1993), 49–87; Mackie, *Achilles in Fire* (1998), 329–338; Winiarczyk, *La mort* (2000), 20–21 with n. 36–39; Currie, *Pindar* (2005), 383–385.

11 *Hom. Od.* XI 601–603.

12 *Hes. Ehoiai*, fr. 25, 26–33; fr. 229, 6–13 Merkelbach-West; *Theog.* 950–953. Other instances in which this apotheosis was mentioned are discussed by Holt, *Herakles' Apotheosis* (1992), 38–56.

13 Scholia to the *Odyssey* attribute passage XI 601–603 to Onomacritus, who lived in the 6th century BC. West, *The Hesiodic Catalogue* (1985), 134, considers the verses in the *Ehoiai* to be an interpolation, but this view is rejected by Dräger, *Untersuchungen zu den Frauenkatalogen* (1997), 1–26.

14 *Hom. Il.* XVIII 117–119.

15 LIMC V 1, 163 no. 3330.

16 LIMC V 1, 163 no. 3331.

only in the second half of the 6th century that Heracles' apotheosis was connected with his death on the pyre and this version did not become popular until the second half of the 5th century.¹⁷

John Boardman notes that it was not until the time of the Peisistratids that painters started presenting Heracles entering Olympus. The earliest depictions originate from c. 560.¹⁸ From this he concludes that none other than Peisistratus supported the cult of Heracles as a god.¹⁹ This would be consistent with what ancient authors wrote about the Athenians being the first to worship Heracles as a god.²⁰ Naturally, not all the cities simultaneously recognised his divine status. As late as the 5th century there existed a custom whereby in a single polis there were two separate sanctuaries for Heracles, one recognising him as a god and the other only as a hero. Herodotus praised and encouraged this practice.²¹ It seems that the association of Heracles with the Phoenician god Melqart (worshipped in Tyre and on the island of Thasos) could have contributed to his own recognition as a god, particularly in the western part of the Mediterranean basin, where Phoenician influence was strong.²² Pindar called Heracles ἥρωξ θεός²³ and the Greeks no

17 The evolution of the Heracles apotheosis myth is presented by Winiarczyk, *La mort* (2000), 13–29.

18 LIMC V 1, 122, no. 2847.

19 Boardman, *Herakles, Peisistratos* (1972), 60. On the association of the Peisistratids with the Heracles cult, see Huttner, *Die politische Rolle* (1997), 25–42, esp. 39 ff. Cf. Brommer, *Vasenlisten zur griechischen Heldensage* (1973), 159–171 (ascension to Olympus), 172–173 (entering Olympus on foot). Boardman, *Herakles, Peisistratos* (1975), 1, reckons that depictions of Heracles on black-figure vases account for 44% of all paintings from the 6th century (up to 510). Moreover, some of the motifs were only added in this period.

20 Isocr. 5, 33; Diod. IV 39, 1; Ael. Arist. *Or.* 1 (*Panathen.*) 50–51 p. 25 Lenz; *Or.* 11 (*Pro Laced.*) 65 p. 708 Lenz; Paus. I 15, 3; I 32, 4–6 (mentions Marathon, a deme which included the properties of Peisistratus); Arrian. *Anab.* IV 11, 7, states that the Delphic Oracle ordered Heracles to be worshipped as a god. Archaeological evidence confirms that Heracles was worshipped in Attica in the 6th century BC. See Woodford, *Cults of Heracles in Attica* (1971), 211–225.

21 Hdt. II 44, 5. This was practiced by the inhabitants of Sicyon (Paus. II 10, 1) and on the island of Cos (SIG³ III 1027 = LSCG 151 C, 8–15). There is no consensus as to whether such a double cult existed on the island of Thasos. See Winiarczyk, *La mort* (2000), 27–28. Verbanck-Piérard, *Le double culte d'Héraclès* (1989), 43–65, presumably is correct to believe that the double cult of Heracles was an exceptional phenomenon because most Greeks worshipped him either as a hero or as a god. Also see Stafford, *Héraklès* (2005), 391–406; *eadem*, *Herakles* (2010), 228–244.

22 Farnell, *Greek Hero Cults* (1921), 145. On the cult of Melqart, which dates back to at least the 9th century BC, see van Berchem, *Sanctuaires d'Hercule-Melqart* (1967), 73–109, 307–336; Lloyd, *Herodotus, Book II* (1976), 205–206 (for older literature); Bonnet, *Melqart* (1988), esp. 399–415; Mettinger, *The Riddle of Resurrection* (2001), 83–111; Malkin, *Herakles and Melqart* (2005), 238–257.

23 Pind. *Nem.* 3, 22.

doubt for a long time continued to view the son of Alcmene and Zeus in this way.²⁴

In the *Iliad* Asclepius is a human, an excellent physician²⁵ and the father of the physicians Machaon and Podalirius, who came from Tricca in Thessaly.²⁶ The myth of Asclepius' birth and death²⁷ appears in Hesiod's *Ehoiai*,²⁸ while Pindar²⁹ considers him to be a hero. It seems probable that Asclepius was for the first time recognised as a god in Epidaurus at the end of the 6th century.³⁰ Initially he was worshipped there together with Apollo Maleatas as a helper of the great god, but then he went on to gradually overshadow his father.³¹ Many temples later dedicated to Asclepius were built on the foundations of sanctuaries to Apollo.³² The earliest evidence of an Asclepius cult, originating from the start of the 5th century, is a bronze plate from Epidaurus with a votive inscription.³³ By the second half of the fifth century Asclepius was considered a great god, and the temple in Epidaurus was setting up affiliated sanctuaries. In 421 the cult was introduced to the port of Zea in Piraeus, at the foot of the Munichia hill, while in 420 an Asclepieion was founded on the southern slope of the Acropolis in Athens.³⁴ The event is

24 On the cult of Heracles, see Farnell, *op. cit.*, 95–145; Bonnet, *op. cit.*, 343–395. Cf. Lévêque, Verbanck-Piérard, “Héraclès héros ou dieu?” (1992), 43–65.

25 Hom. *Il.* IV 194.

26 Hom. *Il.* II 729.

27 Already in ancient times it was disputed whether Asclepius was born in Tricca (Str. IX 5, 17 p. 437) or in Epidaurus (Paus. II 26, 7).

28 Hes. *Ehoiai*, fr. 59–60 Merkelbach-West.

29 Pind. *Pyth.* 3, 7 (475 r.)

30 See Edelstein, *Asclepius* (1945), II, 97–99. Similarly, Wilamowitz-Moelendorf, *Der Glaube der Hellenen* (1932), II, 227 (not before the end of the 6th century). Kern, *Die Religion der Griechen* (1935), II, 307 was of the opinion that the Asclepius cult in Tricca was moved to Epidaurus in the 6th century. A similar view was held by Strabo (IX 5, 17 p. 437) and Herodas (2, 97; 4, 1–2). Holtzman, *Asklepios* (1984), 864, and Garland, *Introducing New Gods* (1992), 117, concede that the beginnings of the Asclepius cult are not entirely clear. One should remember that earlier scholars considered Asclepius to be a chthonic deity (Fauth compiles such literature in *Asklepios* [1964], 645–646). Likewise, Paus. II 26, 10, stresses that Asclepius was a god from the start, but his stance was exceptional among ancient authors. Testimonies regarding Asclepius' apotheosis are found in Edelstein, *op. cit.*, I, 110–175 (T 236–331). Also see Benedun, *Asklepios* (1990), 210–226; Martin, Metzger, *La religion grecque* (1992), 62–68; Benedun, *Der frühe Asklepios* (1996), 9–40; Auffahrt, *Aufnahme*, (1995), 342–347; Graf, *Asklepios* (1997), 94–99; Aston, *Asclepius* (2004), 18–32; Bremmer, *Anaphe, Apollo* (2008), 255–258.

31 Edelstein, *op. cit.*, I, 99–101.

32 Edelstein, *op. cit.*, I, 246, n.16.

33 IG IV² 1, 136.

34 On the history of the Asclepius cult in Athens, see Aleshire, *The Athenian Asklepieion* (1989), 7–20; Clinton, *The Epidauria and the Arrival of Asclepius in Athens* (1994), 17–34; Parker, *Athenian Religion* (1996), 175–185; Riethmüller, *Asklepios* (2005), I, 241–278; Lefantzis, Jensen, *The Athenian Asklepieion* (2009), 91–124.

described in an inscription from the start of the 4th century, on a monument to Telemachus in Athens (IG II², 4960)³⁵.

b. Gods as the founders of cults

After Hades abducted Persephone, Demeter scoured the world in search of her daughter for nine days. Eventually she reached Eleusis, where she let herself be recognised as a god and had a sanctuary built in her name.³⁶ Before reaching Eleusis, she had been hospitably received in various places. In Argos Pelasgus built the Demeter Pelasgis temple for her,³⁷ while in Argolis and Pellene (in Achaea) she was worshipped as Demeter Mysia, on account of the fact that she had been welcomed by Mysios.³⁸ On the road leading to Eleusis a sanctuary for her was built by Phytalos, who had received the goddess in Attica, in return for which she gave him fig tree saplings.³⁹ Demeter's stay in Pheneos inclined Damithales and Trisaules to found a cult to goddess.⁴⁰ The Demeter Pelasgis and Demeter Mysia cults are interesting because Zeus proceeded similarly in Euhemerus' novel.⁴¹ The Greeks also knew of the Zeus Belus cult in Babylon as well as the Zeus Philippios cult in Eresus on the island of Lesbos.⁴²

Another deity that wandered the earth setting up his own cults was Dionysus. Some (Amphictyon and Icarius in Attica, Oeneus in Aetolia) were hospitable towards him, but he also sometimes encountered opposition and then those unfriendly towards him (Lycurgus in Thrace, Pentheus in Thebes, the Minyads in Orchomenus and Proitids in Argolis) he punished severely.⁴³ According to Euripides (*Bacch.* 13–19), Dionysus travelled in Lydia, Phrygia, Persia, Bactria, Media, Arabia Felix and Asia (presumably Asia Minor). Later people started to believe Dionysus reached India. Many scholars maintain that this view only emerged after the expedition of Alexander the

35 See Beschi, *Il monumento di Telemachos* (1967/1968), 381–436; *idem*, *Il rilievo di Telemachos* (1982), 31–43.

36 *Hymn. Hom. in Cer.* 48 ff.

37 Paus. I 14, 2; II 22, 1.

38 Paus. II 18, 3; II 35, 4; VII 27, 9; IG IV 664.

39 Paus. I 37, 2.

40 Paus. VIII 15, 3–4. Further examples are given by Pfister, *Der Reliquienkult* (1909), I, 167.

41 Lact. *Div. inst.* I 22, 21–27 = T 64 A.

42 On Zeus Belus see Hdt. I 181, 2; Ctesias (FGrHist 688 F 1b) ap. Diod. II 8, 7 et II 9, 4; Berossus (FGrHist 680 F 12) ap. Agath. Hist. II 24, 8; Plin. Nat. Hist. VI 121; Philo Bybl. (FGrHist 790 F 2) ap. Euseb. Praep. ev. I 10, 26; Solin. 56, 3. Cf. Tümpel, *Belos* (1899), 259–264; Cook, *Zeus* (1914), I, 756, n. 6; Asheri, in Asheri et al., *A Commentary on Herodotus* (2007), 201. On Zeus Philippios see chapter III 2 E f.

43 Some scholars assume that these myths do not concern historical events. See Sourvinou-Inwood, *Myth as History* (1987), 216; Burkert, *Homo Necans* (1997), 198–199.

Great to the East,⁴⁴ but others presume the myth was older.⁴⁵ Either way the first known accounts of Dionysus' expedition to India are found in the works of Clitarchus and Megasthenes.⁴⁶

c. The tombs of the gods

In ancient literature we find information regarding the tombs of many gods, but most of these testimonia were written by authors living later than Euhemerus.⁴⁷ Some of the Christian authors do not pass on any authentically pagan tradition but arbitrarily situate the graves of pagan gods in places where the cults were the strongest.⁴⁸ The tombs of Dionysus, Asclepius and Zeus deserve particular attention.

The myth of the killing of Asclepius already appears in Hesiod's *Ehoiai*.⁴⁹ Later his death is mentioned, among others, by Stesichorus,⁵⁰ the author of *Ναυπάκτια ἔπη*,⁵¹ Acusilaus,⁵² Pherecydes of Athens⁵³ and Pindar.⁵⁴ However, testimonia concerning Asclepius' grave occurred much later, are rather dubious and play no role in the Asclepius cult.⁵⁵ The legend

-
- 44 E.g. Bethe, *Deinarchos* (1901), 2389 (Who does not rule out the possibility that Dionysus' expedition to India was first presented by Dinarchus); Pfister, *Der Reliquienkult* (1909), I, 169–171; Roux, *Euripide, Les Bacchantes* (1972), II, 244–246; Dihle, *Dionysos in Indien* (1987), 47–57; Bosworth, *Alexander, Euripides, and Dionysos* (1996), 141, 158–159 (n. 8).
- 45 Alföldi, *Die Geschichte des Throntabernakels* (1949/1950), 560 'Dieser welterobende Dionysos ist also nicht erst nach Alexander konzipiert worden, wenn er auch damals eine ungemein starke Aktualität erhielt'; Goukowsky, *Essai sur les origines du mythe d'Alexandre* (1981), II, 11–14.
- 46 Clit. (FGrHist 137 F 17a) ap. *Schol. Apoll. Rhod.* II 904; Megasth. (FGrHist 715 F 11a) ap. Str. XV 1, 6–7 p. 686–687; F 11b ap. Arrian. *Ind.* 5, 4; F 12 ap. Arrian. *Ind.* 7–8.
- 47 Testimonia regarding 13 graves of gods are compiled by Pfister, *Der Reliquienkult* (1909), I, 385–391. Also see Michaelis, *De origine indicis* (1898), 85–86 and Thraede, *Euhemerismus* (1966), 884–885. See Appendix III below.
- 48 Pfister, *op. cit.*, 391–393 'Die Gräber von Aphrodite, Ares, Hades, Helios, Hermes und Selene verdanken ihren Ursprung der christlichen Polemik.'
- 49 Hes. *Ehoiai* fr. 51 Merkelbach-West. Testimonies regarding Asclepius' death are given by Edelstein, *Asclepius* (1945), I, 53–56 (T 105–115). See their commentary in: *op. cit.*, II, 46–52.
- 50 Stesich. fr. 194 Davies.
- 51 Fr. 10 A-B Davies.
- 52 Acusil. (FGrHist 2 F 18) ap. Philod. *De piet.* 45b p. 17 Gomperz = fr. 18 Fowler.
- 53 Pherecyd. (FGrHist 3 F 35a) ap. *Schol. Eurip. Alcest.* 1 (II 216 Schwartz) = fr. 35 Fowler.
- 54 Pind. *Pyth.* 3, 56–57.
- 55 Testimonia regarding Asclepius' grave in: Pfister, *op. cit.*, I, 388–390 and Edelstein, *op. cit.*, I, 57–58 (T 116–120). Also see Cook, *Zeus* (1925), II, 218–221; Roux,

of Dionysus being killed in Argos by Perseus dates back to the 6th BC.⁵⁶ Dionysus' body was first thrown into the Lernaean Swamp⁵⁷ but later laid into a tomb in Delphi. Thus wrote Dinarchus of Delos (c. 300 BC), the author of an epic poem concerning Dionysus' expedition to India,⁵⁸ and also the atidographer Philochorus of Athens (c. 340–263/262).⁵⁹

Of course, the greatest controversies are aroused by the testimonies regarding Zeus' tomb on Crete. Here we should examine whether Euhemerus started this tradition or whether he was referring to an earlier source. Ulrich von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff (1848–1931)⁶⁰ assumed that already Epimenides of Crete linked Zeus' supposed death and tomb with the saying in the *Theogony*, 'the Cretans are always liars,'⁶¹ but other scholars have rightly rejected this view.⁶² Later James Rendel Harris (1852–1941) noted that Theodore of Mopsuestia (350–428) cites a fragment from a panegyric by Minos, the son of Zeus, in his commentary to the *Acts of the Apostles* 17, 18, preserved in the 9th-century Syriac version (*Gannat Busamē, Garden of Pleasure*). In it the Cretans are criticised for showing the tomb of Zeus, who as an immortal could never have died.⁶³ Harris assumed that Theodore cited

L'Architecture de l'Argolide (1961), 192–200; Riethmüller, *Asklepios* (2005), I, 48–49.

- 56 See Kuhnert, *Perseus* (1897–1909), 2016; Pfister, *op. cit.*, II, 394; Casadio, *Storia del culto di Dioniso* (1994), 256–260; Piérart, *La mort* (1992), 141–151; Arrigoni, *Perseo contro Dioniso* (1999), 9–70.
- 57 *Schol. Hom. Il. XIV 319* (III 641 Erbse); Eustath. *Comment. Hom. Il. XIV 320* (III 653 van der Valk).
- 58 Dinarchus, FGrHist 399 F 1 a ap. Syncel. *Ecl. chronogr.* 307 p. 190 Mosshammer, F 1 b ap. Malalam, *Chronogr.* II 15 p. 32 Thurn. Cf. Eus. *Hier. Chron.* p. 54 b Helm. See chapter VIII I C b.
- 59 Philochor. FGrHist 328 F 7 a ap. Syncel. *Ecl. chronogr.* 307 p. 190 Mosshammer and F 7 b ap. Malalam, *Chronogr.* II 15 p. 32 Thurn. See West, *The Orphic Poems* (1983), 150–152; Piérart, *Le tombeau* (1996), 137–154; Arrigoni, *La maschera e lo specchio* (2003), 21–46.
- 60 Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, *Euripides, Hippolytos* (1891), 224, n. 1. Although Maass, *Aratea* (1892), 345–346, accepted this hypothesis, Wilamowitz himself later changed his stance in *Hellenistische Dichtung* (1924), II, 3, 'Am hübschesten wäre es, wenn Epimenides selbst von dem Grabe geredet hätte, aber das ist unerweislich'.
- 61 Epimenides (DK 3 B 1 = FGrHist 457 F 2 = 41 F Bernabé) ap. Paul. *Ep. ad Tit.* 1, 12 Κρήτες ἀεὶ ψεύδονται, κακὰ θηρία, γαστέρες ἀργαί. See e.g. Rohde, *Psyche* (1925), II, 96–102; West, *The Orphic Poems* (1983), 45–53; Strataridaki, *Epimenides* (1991), 207–223; Leclerc, *Épiménide* (1992), 221–233; Tortorelli Ghidini, *Epimenide* (2000), 87–89; Casertano, *Che cosa* (2001), 378–380; Hammerstaedt, *Kallimachos* (2001), 1219–1223 ('Kreter als Lügner'); Tortorelli Ghidini, *Epimenide* (2001), 70–74.
- 62 Kuiper, *Studia Callimachea* (1898), II, 105, n. 1; Poerner, *De Curetibus* (1913), 250; Jacoby, *FGrHist III b 2* (1955), 197, n. 161.
- 63 Harris, *The Cretan Always Liars*, (1906), 305–317, esp. 310–311; *idem*, *A Further Note on the Cretans* (1907), 332–337, esp. 336–337; *idem*, *St. Paul and Epimenides* (1912), 348–353. In the last article Harris cites the fragment of a commentary to the *Acts of the Apostles* by the Nestorian scholar Isho'dad of Merv (9th century),

Epimenides' Μίνως and reconstructed four hexameters in Greek.⁶⁴ Although some scholars have indeed accepted this view,⁶⁵ others rightly rejected it, considering the hexameters to be apocryphal and already attributed in ancient times to Epimenides.⁶⁶

However, one cannot rule out that Zeus' grave was originally written about in the Μουσείον, probably written around the year 400 BC by the Sophist Alcidas, a student of Gorgias and rival of Isocrates. It is probable that this was a source used by the author of the *Certamen Homeri et Hesiodi*, living at the time of the Nerva-Antonine dynasty (96–192).⁶⁷ In it Hesiod sets Homer a riddle which he himself solves by saying that horses will never run for victory around Zeus' tomb, and thus stating that it is impossible for Zeus to die.⁶⁸ In 1891 John Pentland Mahaffy (1839–1919) published a papyrus (*P. Flinders Petrie* 25, now *P. Litt. Lond.* 191) from the 3rd century BC containing Homer's answer to Hesiod's riddle, which is similar to the text in the *Certamen*.⁶⁹ Mahaffy considered the passage to have originated from Alcidas' Μουσείον, even though his name did not appear in the papyrus. Although some scholars have rejected this conjecture and others considered it dubious,⁷⁰ the majority accept it. Friedrich Nietzsche (1844–1900) also believed that Alcidas was the original author of the contest between

who cites a passage from Minos' panegyric preserved in the work of Theodore of Mopsuestia. Also see Harris' introduction to Gibson, *The Commentaries of Isho'dad* (1913), XII–XV.

- 64 Another reconstruction of the four Greek hexameters was proposed by Cook, *Zeus* (1914), I, 664, n. 1.
- 65 Nicklin, *Epimenides' Minos* (1916), 33–37; Dibelius, *Paulus auf dem Areopag* (1939), 26–28.
- 66 H. Gressmann, *PhW* 33, 1913, 936–939; Powell, *On an Alleged New Fragment of Epimenides* (1916), 139–142; *idem*, *Collectanea Alexandrina* (1925), 248; Pohlenz, *Paulus und die Stoa* (1949), 101–104; Dibelius, *Die Reden der Apostelgeschichte* (1949), 56 with n. 2 (Pohlenz's argumentation inclined him to change his earlier views [see n. 65 above]); Verbruggen, *Le Zeus crétois* (1981), 61–63. Also see Kern, *Epimenides* (1907), 176–177, and Courcelle, *Un vers d'Épiménide* (1963), 405–407. Other aspects of works attributed to Epimenides are discussed in four articles in: Federico, Visconti (ed.), *Epiménide* (2001), 195–311.
- 67 Nietzsche, *Der Florentinische Traktat über Homer und Hesiod* (1870), 528–540 and (1873), 211–249; Vogt, *Die Schrift vom Wettkampf Homers und Hesiods* (1959), 193–222; Hess, *Der Agon* (1960); West, *The Contest of Homer and Hesiod* (1967), 433–450; Richardson, *The Contest* (1981), 1–10. Although Nietzsche theory (Alcidas as the source of the *Certamen*) has been questioned by some scholars (Meyer, *Homerische Parerga* [1892], 378, n. 1; Wilamowitz-Moellendorf, *Die Ilias und Homer* [1916], 400–401), others have accepted it.
- 68 *Certamen* 8 p. 328 West ἀμφὶ Διὸς τύμβον. Cf. Plut. *Sept. sap. conv.* 10, 153 F–154 A (here Homer sets the riddle and Hesiod solves it).
- 69 Mahaffy, *The Flinders Petrie Papyri* (1891), I, 70–73.
- 70 Meyer, *Homerische Parerga* (1892), 378, n. 1; Vogt, *Die Schrift* (1959), 208 'Wir lassen diese Frage offen'.

Homer and Hesiod. Likewise, Martin L. West defended this view,⁷¹ noting that no records of this agon had appeared before Alcidamas. Nietzsche's hypothesis was, however, rejected by U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff and later scholars,⁷² who were of the opinion that the agon was not a typically Sophistic invention. According to them, the original version of the story had already existed in the 6th century BC, and it was only later modified by the Sophists. For us it is only important that the author of the agon writes that the existence of Zeus' tomb is an impossibility (ἀδύνατον), though he probably did not have in mind Zeus' tomb on Crete. That is why it seems more likely that Euhemerus was not referring to the Sophist Alcidamas, but to the local Cretan oral tradition.⁷³

Many scholars⁷⁴ believe that on Crete Zeus was initially a fertility god, associated with vegetative cycle. The Velchania festival was celebrated in his honour in spring. He was presented as a beardless youth and worshipped in Hagia Triada, Gortyn, Lyttos and Knossos. Coins from Phaistos (c. 322 – c. 300) display the image of a young man sitting on a tree and holding a cockerel in his right hand. The name on the coin is Velchanos (CEAXANOS).⁷⁵ In the Palaikastro Hymn the Curetes refer to the son of

71 West, *The Contest* (1967), 441 'No, it is difficult to imagine a likelier kind of writer to have invented the contest than a sophist.'

72 Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, *Die Ilias* (1916), 405–406 (stating that the agon was created in the 6th century BC); Vogt, *op. cit.*, 219–220; Pfeiffer, *History of Classical Scholarship* (1968), 50; Richardson, *The Contest* (1981), 1–10, esp. 1 'the sixth century as a more likely date for the story of the contest'; Graziosi, *Inventing Homer* (2002), 102 'The tradition of the *Agon* ... can be traced back to the fifth, and perhaps even the sixth century', cf. pp. 176–180; Koning, *Hesiod* (2010), 239–268, esp. 245 'the sixth century or even earlier'. Today there are no supporters of the old theory that the agon originated from Lesches' epic poem (7th BC) [see Plut. *Sept. sap. conv.* 10, 154 A], though this view was still held by Huxley, *Greek Epic Poetry* (1969), 159–160. Cf. Kivilo, *Early Greek Poet's Lives* (2010), 23–24 'it is possible that the contest was described or at least mentioned in some of the archaic poems ascribed to Lesches'.

73 Supporters of this view include: Rohde, *Psyche* (1925), I, 130–131, n. 1; Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, *Der Glaube der Hellenen* (1932), II, 270, n. 1 'Das Zeusgrab ... kann ich nicht für Erfindung des Euhemeros halten, denn Kallimachos macht dafür die Kreter verantwortlich'; Spyridakis, *Zeus Is Dead* (1992), 5.

74 Kern, *Die Religion der Griechen* (1926), I, 68–70; Nilsson, *The Minoan-Mycenaean Religion* (1950), 541–554; Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, *Der Glaube der Hellenen* (1931), I, 133–134; Laager, *Geburt und Kindheit des Gottes* (1957), 156–194; Willets, *Cretan Cults* (1962), 250–251; West, *The Dictaeon Hymn to Kouros* (1965), 149–159, esp. 154–155; Dietrich, *The Origins of Greek Religion* (1974), 15–17, 239; Nilsson, *Geschichte* (1988), I, 319–324; Postlethwaite, *The Death of Zeus Kretagenes* (1999), 85–98, esp. 88 ff. Also see Otto, *Zeus Kretagenes* (2000), 135–141; Thorne, *Diktaion Zeus* (2000), 149–162; Prent, *Cretan Sanctuaries* (2005), 591–604. Cf. Hesych. s.v. Γελχάνος: ὁ Ζεὺς παρὰ Κρησίν; *Etym. Magn.* s.v. Δίκτη: ἐν ταῦθα δὲ Διὸς ἄγαλμα ἀγένοιον ἵστατο. λέγεται καὶ Δίκταιον.

75 See Le Rider, *Monnaies crétoises* (1966), 91 (no. 38–40), 147, 149 and pl. XXII, 20–24. Cf. Head, *Historia Numorum* (1911), 473. On Zeus Velchanos see Nilsson,

Cronus, that is the Dictaeon Zeus as the greatest kouros, who appeared every year to ensure the fertility of animals and plants.⁷⁶ We have to concede that we do not know how an Indo-European god of weather came to be identified with a Minoan god of vegetation. Although some scholars have rejected this interpretation,⁷⁷ excavations carried out in the 1980s show that in a grotto on Mount Ida a cult continued to exist from the Minoan age to Greek times.⁷⁸ We should add that in the years 1987–1990 British archaeologists conducted excavations at Roussolakkos, near Palaikastro and in the vicinity of Mount Petsopha (ancient Dicte), in eastern Crete. There they discovered a Minoan figurine of a beardless youth (c. 1500 BC). It is assumed that this is an effigy of a god, since it was made using the chryselephantine technique. This suggests that the figure is that of the kouros to whom the Palaikastro Hymn later referred.⁷⁹

Zeus' Cretan tomb was referred to by another 70 authors after Euhemerus. Some wrote about it more than once (Lucian as many as five times), which is why we have some 80 testimonia, from the time of Callimachus to the late Byzantine period.⁸⁰ They were written by 23 pagan writers (14 Greek

The Minoan-Mycenaean Religion (1950), 550–553 (for epigraphic, numismatic and archaeological sources); Bile, *Le dialecte crétois* (1988), 361; Capdeville, *L'oracle de l'Ida* (1990), 89–90; Faure, *Nouvelles identifications* (1993), 71.

76 Text in: Furley, Bremer, *Greek Hymns* (2001), II, 1–2 (with commentary on pp. 2–20) ἰὼ μέγιστε Κοῦρε. See e.g. West, *The Dictaeon Hymn* (1965), 149–159; Perlman, *Invocatio and Imprecatio* (1995), 161–167; Furley, Bremer, *op. cit.*, I, 68–75; Alonge, *Greek Hymns* (2011), 217–234, esp. 221 ff. (p. 224, n. 15 'I have no faith whatsoever in the Minoan pedigree of either the Hymn itself or the cult of Zeus for which it was composed'). The hymn was inscribed in stone in the 3rd century AD and originates from the 4th or 3rd century BC. Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, *Griechische Verskunst* (1921), 502, believed it was the 5th century BC, whereas Prent, *Cretan Sanctuaries* (2005), 537 and 544 reckons it could even date back to the 6th century ('6th–4th century Hymn'). On the Palaikastro sanctuary see Sporn, *Heiligtümer und Kulte Kretas* (2002), 45–49; Prent, *Cretan Sanctuaries* (2005), 532–550; Kreutz, *Zeus* (2007), 130–135.

77 Marinatos, *Die Wanderung des Zeus* (1962), 903–916; Faure, *Fonctions des cavernes crétoises* (1964), 120; Verbruggen, *Le Zeus crétois* (1981), 69–70, 220–222. Cf. Jung, Kerényi, *Das göttliche Kind* (1940), 71–74; Faure, *La vie quotidienne en Crète* (1973), 304–305, questioned the generally accepted view that the essence of Minoan religion was the Great Mother Goddess and her accompanying young god, who dies soon after the *hieros gamos* and is reborn every spring. See Bloodow, *Evidence for an Early Date for the Cult of Cretan Zeus* (1991), 169, n. 146; Marinatos, *The Goddess* (2000), 112–119, esp. 112 'it is very unlikely that there was one goddess. ... Minoan/Mycenaean iconography does not support the monotheistic position, because several deities may appear on rings or seals simultaneously'.

78 Sakellarakis, *The Idaean Cave* (1988), 207–214, n. 211–213.

79 See MacGillivray, Sackett, *The Palaikastro Kouros* (2000), 165–169; Furley, Bremer, *Greek Hymns* (2001), I, 71–76.

80 Kokolakis, *Zeus' Tomb* (1995), 124, n. 8, knows of only 43 testimonia. Some testimonies are mentioned by Cook, *Zeus* (1925), II, 940–943 and *Zeus* (1940), III, 1173.

and 9 Roman)⁸¹, 28 Christians (19 Greek and 9 Roman)⁸² as well as 19 later authors (16 Byzantine, two Roman and one Syriac).⁸³ The first testimony was provided by the Alexandrian poet Callimachus of Cyrene, but the dating of his *Hymn to Zeus* and *Iambus* 1 is controversial.⁸⁴ The poet regards the Cretans to be liars because they show on their island the tomb of Zeus, who in his opinion never died. Most scholars assume that in the *Hymn to Zeus* Callimachus alludes to Euhemerus, whom he also criticises in *Iambus* 1.⁸⁵ Zeus grave is also mentioned in the 3rd century BC by Dionysius Scytobra-

-
- 81 Callim. *Hymn. Iov.* 8–9; *Jamb.* 12, 16 (fr. 202 Pfeiffer = fr. 163 Asper); *P. Flinders Petrie* 25 (= *P. Litt. Lond.* 191); Dion Scyt. fr. 13 Rusten ap. Diod. III 61 2; Ennius, *Euhem.* fr. 12 Vahlen ap. Lact. *Div. inst.* I 11, 46 et Lact. *Epit. div. inst.* 13, 4 (= Euhem. T 69 A–B Winiarczyk); Varro, *De litoralibus* ap. Solin. *Coll. rer. mem.* 11, 6–7; Cic. *Nat. deor.* III 53; Philod. *De piet.* 52 a p. 24 Gomperz; Gaetul. in *Anth. Pal.* VII 275, 6; Lucan. *Phars.* VIII 872; Stat. *Theb.* I 278–279; Mela, *Chor.* II 112; Plut. *Sept. sap. conv.* 10, 154 A; Ptol Chen. *Nov. hist.* II 16 p. 22 Chatzis ap. Phot. *Bibl.* 190 p. 147 b 37 (III 55 Henry); Luc. *Deor. conc.* 6; *De sacrific.* 10; *Iup. trag.* 45; *Philops.* 3; *Timon* 6; *Cert. Hom. et Hes.* 8 p. 328 West; Philostr. *Vitae soph.* II 4 (II 76 Kayser); Porph. *Vita Pyth.* 17; Ps.-Pyth. in *Anth. Pal.* VII 746; Serv. *Comm. Verg. Aen.* VII 180; *Anth. Lat.* 432 Riese = 430 Shackleton Bailey; Nonnus, *Dion.* VIII 114–118.
- 82 Tat. *Or. ad. Greg.* 27, 4; Theoph. *Ad Autol.* I 10, 4; II 3, 8; Athenag. *Leg.* 30, 2; *Orac. Sib.* VIII 47–48; *Acta Apoll.* 22 p. 32 Knopf-Krüger; Cl. Al. *Protr.* II 37, 4 (I 28 Stählin); Min. Fel. *Oct.* 23, 13 (= 21, 8); Tert. *Ad. nat.* II 17; *Apolog.* 25; Orig. *C. Cels.* III 43; Cypr. *Quod idola* 2; Arnob. *Adv. nat.* IV 14; IV 25; Eus. *Praep. ev.* II 2, 48; III 10, 21; Firm. Mat. *De errore* 7, 6; Lact. *Div. inst.* I 11, 48; Commod. *Instr.* I 6, 16; Greg. Naz. *Or.* 5, 32 (PG 35, 705 B); Ps.-Caesar. *Erotapokriseis* 111 p. 91 Riedinger; *Acta Acacii* 2 p. 58 Knopf-Krüger; Epiph. *Panar.* 42, 12 (II 169 Holl); *Anc.* 106 (I 128 Holl); Ps.-Clem. *Hom.* V 23, 2; VI 21, 2; *Recog.* X 23, 4; Ioh. Chrys. *In ep. Pauli ad Tit. hom.* 3, 1 (PG 62, 677A); Sever. *In ep. Pauli ad Tit.* 1, 12–13 p. 344 Staab; Hier. *In ep. Pauli ad Tit.* 1 (CCL 77 C, 30; *Ep.* 70, 2 (CSEL 54, 701); Theod. Mops. *Comment. in Acta ap.* 17, 18 ap. Gannat Busamē (versio Anglica ap. Harris, *A Further Note* [1907], 310); *idem, In ep. Pauli ad Tit.* 1, 12–13a *comment.*, p. 752 Greer; Cyrill. *C. Iul.* X 342 (PG 76, 1028 B); Theodoret. *Interpr. ep. Pauli ad Tit.* 1, 12 (PG 82, 861 B); Paulin. Nol. *Poema* 19, 86 (CSEL 30, 121), *Mart. Rom. Ign.* 3, 2 (II 343–344 Funk-Diekamp).
- 83 Nonnus Abbas, *Collect. et expos. hist. ad Greg. Naz. Or.* 2 c. *Iul.* 30 (PG 36, 1049 D–1052 A); Ioh. Ant. *Hist.* fr. 5 et fr. 6, 4 (FHG IV 542); *Chron. Pasch.* 44 (PG 92, 164 B–C); Cosmas Hier. *Hist. ad carm. Greg. Naz.* 263 (PG 38, 504); Sync. *Ecl. chronogr.* 289 p. 179 Mosshammer; Isho'dad, *Comment. in Acta ap.* p. 29 Gibson = Harris, *St. Paul* (1914), 351–352; Sedul. Scot. *Collect. in ep. Pauli ad Tit.* (PL 103, 244 C); Ps.-Luc. *Philopatris* 10; Suda s.v. Πῆκος (IV 124 Adler); Sym. Metaphr. *Mart. Ign.* 7, 5 (II 387 Funk-Diekamp); Mich. Psel. ἀλληγορία εἰς τὸν Τάνταλον p. 154 Duffy; Cedren. *Hist. comp.* 29 et 31 (PG 121, 56 C et 57 D); *Schol. Callim. Hymn. Iov.* 8 (II 42 Pfeiffer); *Schol. Luc. Iov. trag.* 45 p. 78 Rabe; *Schol. Arat.* 73 p. 108 Martin; *Commenta Bern. Lucan. Phars.* VIII 872; *Schol. Carm. Greg. Naz.* p. 49 Gaisford; Ps.-Eudocia, *Viol.* 414 p. 311–312 Flach.
- 84 See chapter I 1.
- 85 See chapter I 1.

chion⁸⁶ in a novel about the Libyan Dionysus.⁸⁷ The translation of Euhemerus' work into Latin (*Euhemerus sive Sacra historia*), by the poet Ennius (c. 200–194)⁸⁸ greatly contributed to its popularity. The Platonist Celsus, in his criticism of Christianity in the Ἀληθὴς λόγος, c. 178 AD, believed that the Cretans treated Zeus' grave allegorically, but Origen (c. 185–253/254) decidedly rejected such an attempt to save the pagan tradition.⁸⁹ The Sophist Antiochus of Aegae (c. 200 AD) was the author of a rhetorical declamation (μελέτη), in which he defended the Cretans from criticism for showing the tomb of Zeus.⁹⁰ According to the Neo-Platonist Porphyry (c. 234–301/305), Pythagoras, dressed in a robe of black wool, descended into the Idaean cave to lay an offering to Zeus. There he saw the god's throne, which every year was covered with a new carpet, and even left an inscription on his tomb. He was said to have spent 27 days there.⁹¹ Christian writers combating pagan religion willingly referred to Zeus' tomb in order to show that the chief god of the Greek pantheon was actually a human being. Likewise the pagan Lucian of Samosata had a critical attitude towards folk religious beliefs and several times referred to Zeus' tomb.

In ancient times Zeus' tomb was situated on Mount Ida (Varro,⁹² Porphyry, Cyril of Alexandria), Mount Dicte (Nonnus of Panopolis) or in Knossos (Euhem. T 69 A-B, John Malalas). However, the tradition of Zeus' tomb being on Mount Juktas most probably only emerged in early modern times,⁹³ because the first person to mention it was Cristoforo Buondel-

86 Until recently it was believed the Dionysius Scytobrachion lived in the 2nd century BC. This was the opinion, for instance, of Jacoby, *FGrHist I a* (1923), 509 (second half of the 3rd century BC) and Gärtner, *Dionysios* (1967), 69. However, Rusten, *Dionysius* (1982), 19–29, proved that in *P. Hibeh 186* there are fragments from the myth of the Argonauts taken from a work by Dionysius. Turner, *The Hibeh Papyri* (1955), II, 53–55 dated this papyrus to c. 250–220, and Rusten, *op. cit.*, 28, to c. 200. Therefore Rusten, *op. cit.*, 89–90, estimated Dionysius to have lived from c. 270 (in *Libyan Histories* there is an allusion to θεοὶ ἀδελφοί) to c. 220.

87 Dionys. Scyt. fr. 13 Rusten ap. Diod. III 61, 2. Although Jacoby, *op. cit.*, 513, 23, reckoned this passage had been added by Diodorus, Rusten, *op. cit.*, 110 and n. 57, defended the authenticity of this fragment.

88 See chapter VII.

89 Orig. *C. Cels.* III 43 αἰνιττόμενος τροπικὰς ὑπονοίας καθ' ἧς πεπλάσθαι λέγεται ὁ περὶ τοῦ Διὸς μῦθος. Zob. Andresen, *Logos und Nomos* (1955), 26.

90 Philostr. *Vitae soph.* II 4 (II 76 Kayser). See Kokolakis, *Zeus' Tomb* (1995), 123.

91 Porphyry. *Vita Pyth.* 17. See Rohde, *Psyche* (1925), I, 129–130, n. 3.

92 Although Varro does not explicitly state that the tomb was on Mount Ida, he may have thought so because Solinus 11, 6, mentions Mount Ida whilst referring to information regarding Zeus' tomb from Varro's *De litoralibus*.

93 E.g. Cook, *Zeus* (1914), I, 158–162; Nilsson, *The Minoan-Mycenaean Religion* (1950), 461–462; Faure, *Le mont Iouktas* (1958), 133–148; Dietrich, *The Origins of Greek Religion* (1974), 297 n. 48; Verbruggen, *Le Zeus crétois* (1981), 63–67; Rutkowski, *The Cult Places of the Aegean* (1986), 1–2. The tradition of Zeus' tomb on Mt Juktas has been regarded as being of ancient origin by Karetsoy, *The Peak*

monti (1385–1430), who left a description of Crete after he visited it in 1415.⁹⁴

According to Euhemerus, there was a simple inscription over Zeus' tomb which read ZAN KPONOY.⁹⁵ Ζᾱν is the Doric form of the name Zeus.⁹⁶ Later writers mentioned five longer versions of the inscription, which I cite in my commentary to Euhem. T 69 A.⁹⁷ It is worth noting that according to scholia to the Callimachus' *Hymn to Zeus* 1, 8 (II 42 Pfeiffer), tradition regarding Zeus' tomb resulted from a misunderstanding. On Crete there was the tomb of Minos, the son of Zeus, above which there was the inscription Μίνωος τοῦ Διὸς τάφος. The first two words of this inscription were worn away, which left just the words Διὸς τάφος. Thus the Cretans started speaking of the tomb of Zeus. This is a very interesting but isolated attempt to explain how the tradition of Zeus' tomb in Crete began.

Some scholars have assumed that in ancient times Zeus' tomb was a tourist attraction. Conrad Cichorius (1863–1932) believed that Varro had seen it,⁹⁸ whereas H. Verbruggen was of the opinion that Cicero had also mentioned it as a tourist venue.⁹⁹ According to Lionel Casson (1914–2009), however, ancient travellers visited the cave where Zeus was born, but he does not mention the visiting of Zeus' tomb.¹⁰⁰

It seems to me that, on the basis of a local tradition, Euhemerus was the first author to write about Zeus' Cretan tomb. In the 3rd century BC his Ἱερὰ Ἀναγραφή was referred to by Callimachus and Dionysius Scytobrachion. Later, 70 authors wrote about the grave, some approvingly as a criticism of

Sanctuary of Mt. Juktas (1981), 137–153, esp. 153 and Bloedow, *Evidence* (1991), 162. Karetsou conducted excavations on Mt Juktas in the years 1974–1986 and on its peak discovered an altar constructed not far from a chasm ('on the lip of the chasm' p. 141). However, there is no basis to assume this to have been Zeus' altar and the chasm his grave.

94 Buondelmonti, *Descriptio insule Crete* (1981), 154, lin. 681–155 lin. 692.

95 Euhem. T 69 A ap. Lact. *Div. inst.* I 11, 46. Cf. *Commenta Bern. Lucan. Phars.* VIII 872 'ostendunt tumulum et lapidem sub hab inscriptione ZAN (codd. TAN) KPONOY'.

96 See Cook, *Zeus* (1925), II, 350–354; Schindler, *Zeus* (1978), 1001.

97 Porph. *Vita Pyth.* 17; *Anth. Pal.* VII 746 = Cyril. *C. Iul.* X 342 (PG 76, 1028 B); Ioh. Chrys. *In ep. Pauli ad Tit. hom.* 3, 1 (PG 62, 676); Ioh. Ant. F 5 (FHG IV 452); Suda s. v. Πῆκος (IV 124 Adler) = Cedren. *Hist. comp.* 31 (PG 121, 57 D) = Ps.-Eudoc. *Violar.* 414 p. 311 Flach; *Chron. Pasch.* 44 (PG 92, 164 B). See Gelzer, *Sextus Julius Africanus* (1880), I, 77.

98 Cichorius, *Römische Studien* (1922), 212. Similarly Faure, *Le mont Iouktas* (1958), 134–135; Rutkowski, *The Cult Places* (1986), 1–2. See Solin. 11, 6–7 'Varro in opere quod de litoralibus est etiam suis temporibus adfirmat sepulcrum Jovis ibi visitatum'.

99 Verbruggen, *Le Zeus crétois* (1981), 57 cites Cic. *Nat. deor.* III 53 'cuius in insula sepulcrum ostenditur', but this testimony in no way implies that the sepulchre was a tourist attraction.

100 Casson, *Travel in Ancient World* (1974), 233.

paganism, some expressing outrage, and others in an attempt to justify or explain how this tradition began.

B. Euergetism

From the very start there existed in Greek literature a conviction that one may call a god (θεός) a person who performed benefactions for an individual, a group of people or an entire society, in other words someone who has become a benefactor (εὐεργέτης) or saviour (σωτήρ).¹⁰¹ The Trojans sometimes recognised Hector as a god¹⁰² as did the Greeks with regard to Achilles¹⁰³ because both had fought valiantly. Odysseus told Nausicaa that when he returned to his homeland, he would pray to her as to a god for she had saved his life.¹⁰⁴ In Aeschylus' *Suppliants* (v. 980–983) Danaus convinces his daughters that it is right to pray to the Argive people, offer them sacrifices and libations just like they would for Olympian gods because they were their saviours (σωτήρες). In the *Rhesus* tragedy (v. 355–358), attributed to Euripides, the Trojan guards greet Rhesus, the king of Thrace who came to help Troy, as Zeus. At the funeral of soldiers killed at the battle on Samos 444/443, Pericles declares that they have become immortal gods because they gave up their lives for the homeland.¹⁰⁵ A comedy by Eupolis states that the Athenians prayed to their commanders as to gods and that they actually were gods.¹⁰⁶ Aristotle considers it obvious that benefactors (εὐεργέται) deserve various forms of gratitude, including the offering of sacrifices (θυσίαι) and their own temenos. This view was commonly held in the Hellenistic period and also among those living under the Roman Empire.¹⁰⁷ At the core

101 Nock, *Notes on Ruler-Cult* (1928), 31–32, reprint in *idem, Essays* (1972), I, 145; Charlesworth, *Some Observations on Ruler Cult* (1935), 8–16; Stewart, *Il culto del sovrano* (1977), 562–564; Fredricksmeyer, *On the Background of the Ruler Cult* (1981), 148–149; Dörrie, *Gottesvorstellung* (1983), 139–140; Nilsson, *Geschichte* (1988), II, 137.

102 Hom. *Il.* XXII 393–394; XXIV 258–259.

103 Hom. *Od.* XI 484.

104 Hom. *Od.* VIII 467–468.

105 Stesimbrotus (FGrHist 107 F 9) ap. Plut. *Per.* 8, 9 ἀθανάτους ἔλεγε (scil. Περικλῆς) γεγονέναι καθάπερ θεούς.

106 Eupolis, fr. 384 Kassel-Austin (PCG V 509), ὥσπερ εἰ θεοῖσιν.

107 Plaut. *Asinar.* 713 'ut deo mi hic immolas bovem'; Plaut. *Captivi* 863 'nam ego nunc tibi sum summus Iuppiter'; Plaut. *Persa* 99–100 'o mi Iuppiter terrestris'; Plaut. *Pseudol.* 328. For more on Plautus' testimonies, see Hanson, *Plautus* (1959), 51–53, 69; Gradel, *Emperor Worship* (2004), 44–49. Terent. *Adelph.* 535 'facio te apud illum deum'; Caecil. *Com.* fr. 264 Ribbeck^{2–3} 'homo homini deus est si suum officium sciat'; Cic. *Cum sen. grat. egit* 8 'P. Lentulus, parens ac deus nostrae vitae'; Cic. *Cum pop. grat. egit* 11; Cic. *Pro Sest.* 144; Verg. *Ecl.* 1, 6–7 'deus nobis haec otia fecit // namque erit ille mihi semper deus (scil. Octavianus)'.

of this belief was the conviction that one of the most important attributes of a deity was the performance of benefactions (τὸ εὐεργετεῖν).¹⁰⁸ By performing good deeds a person likened himself to a god.¹⁰⁹ Such a view may also be found in Christian literature.¹¹⁰

The words θεός/θεῖος and *deus/divus/divinus* were therefore used metaphorically to express admiration or emphasise the exceptional qualities of an individual or an object.¹¹¹ That is why people distinguishing themselves

108 Hom. *Od.* VIII 325 et Hes. *Theog.* 46 θεοὶ δωτῆρες ἑάων; Democr. (DK 68 B 175) ap. Stob. II 9, 4; Pl. *Resp.* II 379 C; Arist. *Ethic. Nic.* IX, 1162 a 5–6; Chrysip. (SVF II 1115) ap. Plut. *Stoic. rep.* 38, 1051 E; Antip. Tars. (SVF III 33) ap. Plut. *Stoic. rep.* 38, 1051 F; Cic. *Nat. deor.* II 60 ‘multae autem aliae naturae deorum ex magnis beneficiis non sine causa et a Graeciae sapientissimis et a maioribus nostris constitutae nominataeque sunt’; Dion. Hal. *Ant. Rom.* II 62, 5; Pollux I 40–41 πρόχειρος εἰς εὐεργεσίαν.

109 Cic. *Pro Lig.* 38 ‘homines enim ad deos nulla re propius accedunt quam salutem hominibus dando’; Str. X 3, 9 p. 467; Plin. *Nat. hist.* II 18 ‘deus est mortali iuvare mortalem’; Sen. *Benef.* III 15, 4 ‘qui dat beneficia, deos imitatur’; Ael. *Var. hist.* XII 59; *Gnom. Vat.* 53; Ps.-Arist. *Ep.* 4 p. 31 Plezia τὴν εὐεργεσίαν θεῷ ἰσόμοιον. That is why I consider wrong the view of Gale, *Myth and Poetry* (1994), 77, who argues that an euhemeristic influence may be discerned in the introduction to book V of Lucretius’ *De rerum natura*. In my opinion, in this particular passage we can see the influence of euergetism, a concept which was well known in the Hellenistic era, in the Greek and Roman worlds alike. If Gale knew my citations from Plautus’ comedy (see n. 107 above), she would no doubt also consider their author to have been a supporter of Euhemerus’ views.

110 *Ep. ad Diog.* 10, 6; Greg. Naz. *Or.* 14, 26 (PG 35, 891).

111 Already in the epic poetry of Homer we frequently come across the hemistich θεός δ’ ὥς τίετο δῆμῳ (*Il.* V 78; XVI 605; *Od.* XIV 205), which is meant as a mark of great respect. See Taeger, *Charisma* (1957), I, 59–60; Roloff, *Gottähnlichkeit* (1970), 7–8, 29–30. From the 6th century onwards poets willingly speak of a distinguished person as ‘a god among men’. E.g. Theog. 339 μετ’ ἀνθρώπων θεός; Antiphanes, *Tritagonistes* fr. 207 Kassel-Austin (PCG II 434) θεός ἐν ἀνθρώποισιν. Cf. Isocr. *Euag.* 72 εἰ τινες τῶν ποιητῶν περί τινος τῶν προγεγενημένων ὑπερβολαῖς κέχρηται, λέγοντες ὡς ἦν θεός ἐν ἀνθρώποις; Arist. *Polit.* III 13, 1284 a 11 ὥσπερ γὰρ θεὸν ἐν ἀνθρώποις εἰκὸς εἶναι τὸν τοιοῦτον. See Baldson, *The ‘Divinity’ of Alexander* (1950), 363–371 (‘The Influence of Isocrates and Aristotle’); Ehrenberg, *Alexander and the Greeks* (1938), 73–74 (ὥσπερ θεός ἐν ἀνθρώποις is ‘a rather conventional and certainly old phrase’). Also see Guthrie, *A History of Greek Philosophy* (1965), II, 477, n. 2; Einsenberger, *Demokrits Vorstellung vom Sein und Wirken der Götter* (1970), 148; Betz, *Gottmensch* (1983), 235. For the meaning of the word θεός, see e.g. Wilamowitz-Moellendorf, *Der Glaube* (1931), I, 17–19; Kleinknecht, *Θεός und θεῖος* (1938), 65–79, 122–123; Pötscher, *ΘΕΟΣ* (1953); *idem*, *Das Person-Bereichdenken* (1959), 5–25; *idem*, *Person-Bereichdenken und Personifikation* (1978), 217–231. Reprints of both articles with an afterword by the author in *idem*, *Hellas und Rom* (1988), 49–89; Price, *Gods and Emperors* (1984), 79–95; Erbse, *Untersuchungen zur Funktion der Götter* (1986), 9–11; Clauss, *Kaiser und Gott* (1999), 17–26; Henrichs, *What Is a Greek God* (2010), 19–39; Burkert, *Griechische Religion* (2011), 406–407. With regard to θεῖος ἀνὴρ, see e.g. Weinreich, *Antikes Gottmenschentum* (1926), 633–651; Bieler, *ΘΕΙΟΣ ANHP* (1935–1936);

with ἀρετή,¹¹² wisdom,¹¹³ beauty¹¹⁴ as well as those performing extraordinary feats were called gods.¹¹⁵

In the Archaic and Classical periods hero cults (ἡρωικαὶ τιμαί) were often given to the founders of cities (ἥρωες κτίστης),¹¹⁶ distinguished commanders who had died defending a city, lawgivers, philosophers, physicians, poets and Olympic victors.¹¹⁷ This cult concerned the deceased, whose

-
- Betz, *Gottmensch* (1983), 234–312; Anderson, *Sage, Saint* (1994); Du Toit, *Theios Anthropos* (1997); Burkert, *Vergöttlichung* (2005), 401–419, reprint in *idem, Kleine Schriften* (2011), 259–276; Currie, *Pindar and the Cult of Heroes* (2005), 158–200; Currie, *Heroes and Holy Men* (2007), 163–203.
- 112 Arist. *Eth. Nic.* VII 1, 1145 a 23–24 εἰ, καθάπερ φασίν, ἐξ ἀνθρώπων γίνονται θεοὶ δι' ἀρετῆς ὑπερβολήν. Compare with: Isocr. *Euag.* 70 εἴ τινες τῶν προγεγενημένων δι' ἀρετὴν ἀθάνατοι γεγόνασιν; Isocr. *Phil.* 132 διὰ τὴν ἀρετὴν εἰς θεοὺς ἀνίγαγε (scil. Ἡρακλῆς).
- 113 **Pythagoras**: Hermippus (fr. 20 Wehrli = FGrHist 1026 F 25) ap. Diog. Laert. VIII 41 θεῖος; Ael. *Var. hist.* II 26 (=Arist. *De Pythag.* fr. 1 B p. 130 Ross = fr. 173 Gigon) Ἀπόλλων Ὑπερβορεῖος; Porph. *Vita Pyth.* 20 θεὸν τινα; Iambl. *Vita Pyth.* 255 θεῖος; Iambl. *Vita Pyth.* 140 (= Arist. *de Pythag.* fr.1 E p. 131 Ross) θεός; Diog. Laert. VIII 11 (= Arist. *De Pythag.* fr. 1 D p. 131 Ross) Ἀπόλλων ἐξ Ὑπερβορέων; Iambl. *Vita Pyth.* 30 (= Arist. *De Pythag.* fr. 2 p. 132 Ross = fr. 156 Gigon) τὸν ἐξ Ὑπερβορέων Ἀπόλλωνα; **Empedocles**: DK 31 B 112 = fr. 1 Inwood ap. Diog. Laert. VIII 62 θεὸς ἄμβροτος οὐκέτι θνητός ... σεβίζομαι; Heraclid. fr. 83 Wehrli ap. Diog. Laert. VIII 68 θύειν αὐτῷ δεῖν καθάπερ εἰ θεῷ; Diog. Laert. VIII 70; **Plato**: Cic. *De orat.* I 106, cf. II 179; Cic. *Nat. deor.* II 32 'deus quidam philosophorum'; Cic. *Ad Attic.* IV 16, 3 'deus ille noster'; **Epicurus**: Lucr. V 8 'deus ille fuit'; Cic. *Tusc. disp.* I 48; Luc. *Alex.* 61 ἀνδρὶ ὡς ἀληθῶς ἱερῷ καὶ θεσπεσίῳ; compare with Diog. Laert. X 135 ζῆσεις δὲ ὡς θεὸς ἐν ἀνθρώποις (on a person who lives according to the teachings of Epicurus). See Gale, *Myth and Poetry* (1994), 191–207; Erler, *Epicurus as deus mortalis* (2002), 159–181. **Iamblichus**: Damasc. *In Phileb.* 227 p. 107 Westerink θεῖος; According to Plato (*Resp.* IV 500 D) the philosopher becomes θεῖος εἰς τὸ δυνατόν ἀνθρώπῳ. See Roloff, *Gottähnlichkeit* (1970), 198–206. Testimonia on the divinity of poets are listed by Bieler, *ΘΕΙΟΣ ANHP* (1935), I, 12 and Roloff, *op. cit.*, 117–121.
- 114 Charax (FGrHist 103 F 13) Ἰο θεὸς ἐνομήσθη διὰ τὸ κάλλος; *Expos. tot. mundi* 44 (SCh 124 p. 180 Rouge); cf. Diog. Laert. X 5.
- 115 Isocr. *Ep. ad Phil.* 3, 5 οὐδὲν γὰρ ἔσται λοιπὸν ἔτι πλὴν θεὸν γενέσθαι (after the conquest of Persia). On various interpretations of this expression, see Taeger, *Isokrates und die Anfänge des hellenistischen Herrscherkultes* (1937), 355–360 'eine gnomische Wendung'; Wüst, *Philipp II.* (1938), 172–173, n. 4 (polemic with Taeger); Ehrenberg, *Alexander* (1938), 73, n. 1; Tarn, *Alexander the Great* (1948), II, 365–369; Balsdon, *The 'Divinity' of Alexander* (1950), 363 ff. (polemic with Tarn); Kehl, *Die Monarchie im politischen Denken des Isokrates* (1962), 110 (Isocrates proposed to Philip 'Gottkönigtum'); Bengtson, *Griechische Geschichte*, (1996), 326, n.1; Schmitt, *Herrscherkult* (2005), 445 'Isokrates' Wort ... ist zwar wohl nicht Aufforderung zur Selbstvergottung, sondern Warnung vor Hybris.'
- 116 E.g. see Leschhorn, 'Gründer der Stadt' (1984); Malkin, *Religion and Colonization* (1987), 189–266.
- 117 Lists of heroized individuals are given by Farnell, *Greek Hero Cults* (1921), 361–372, 420–426; Cerfaux, Tondriau, *Un concurrent de christianisme* ((1957), 459–

graves were often found in the agora. However, in the 4th century the mentality of the Greeks changed.¹¹⁸ The hero status started being bestowed on the living, for instance on Dion, who in 356 freed Syracuse from the tyranny of Dionysius II,¹¹⁹ as well as on the founders of cities.¹²⁰ The Greeks thus became accustomed to the idea that the ἥρωικαὶ τιμαί, which previously only applied to the deceased, could be bestowed on a living εὐεργέτης.¹²¹ At the start of the Hellenistic era benefactions were above all performed by

-
- 466; Speyer, *Heros* (1988), 866–869. On the hero cult, see e.g. Nock, *The Cult of Heroes* (1944), 141–174, reprint in *idem*, *Essays* (1972), 575–602; Coldstream, *Hero Cults in the Age of Homer* (1976), 8–17; Hadzisteliou Price, *Hero Cult* (1979), 219–228; Snodgrass, *Les origines du culte des héros* (1982), 107–119; *idem*, *The Archaeology of the Hero* (1988), 19–26; Whitley, *Early States and Hero Cults* (1988), 173–182; Kearns, *Between God and Man* (1992), 65–99; Antonaccio, *An Archaeology of Ancestors* (1995); Whitley, *Tomb Cult and Hero Cult* (1995), 43–63; Boehringer, *Zur Heroisierung historischer Persönlichkeiten* (1996), 37–61; Hägg (ed.), *Ancient Greek Hero Cult* (1999) [collection of 12 articles]; Rodríguez Moreno, *Le héros comme μεταξὺ entre l'homme et la divinité* (2000), 91–100; Boehringer, *Heroenkulte* (2001); Ekroth, *The Sacrificial Rituals of Greek Hero-Cults* (2002); Bremmer, *The Rise of the Hero Cult* (2006), 15–20; Currie, *Heroes and Holy Men* (2007), 163–203; Delatte, 'HMIΘEOΣ' (2007), 481–510; Parker, *On Greek Religion* (2011), 287–292 ('The Early History of Hero Cult').
- 118 I have considerable reservations as to whether the case of the boxer Euthymos of Lokroi is evidence that already in the 5th century people were heroized in their lifetimes, as Currie, *Euthymos* (2002), 24–44, believes.
- 119 Diod. XVI 20, 6. Berve, *Dion* (1957), 94, n. 1; Taeger, *Charisma* (1957), I, 154 with n. 11; Zahrt, *Dions Rückkehr* (2000), 171–179 questioned this, but other scholars believe it to be plausible, e.g. Taylor, *The Divinity* (1931), 94 with n. 17; Habicht, *Gottmenschentum* (1970), 9–10, 244–245 (convincingly refuting the arguments of Berve and Taeger); Nilsson, *Geschichte* (1988), II, 137; Bosworth, *Heroic Honours in Syracuse* (2003), 11–28 (polemic with Zahrt); Buraselis, *Political Gods* (2003), 186–188. Cf. Badian, *The Deification of Alexander* (1981), 42–43; Fredricksmeier, *On the Background* (1981), 152–153. See chapter III 2 E c.
- 120 E.g. Demetrius Poliorcetes, who founded Sicyon for a second time in 303 (Diod. XX 102, 3), in c. 293 Demetrias in Thessaly (Str. IX 5, 15 p. 436). See Habicht, *Gottmenschentum* (1970), 74–76; Leschhorn, 'Gründer der Stadt' (1984), 258–268; Cohen, *The Hellenistic Settlements* (1995), 111–114. Lysimachus was considered the new founder of Ephesus, for around the year 294 he moved the city closer to the sea and called it Arsinoeia in honour of his wife; nevertheless, the old name was restored by Seleucus I in 281 (Str. XIV 1, 21 p. 640). See Habicht, *op. cit.*, 40–41; Leschhorn, *op. cit.*, 255–257; Cohen, *op. cit.*, 177–180.
- 121 With regard to the differences between the divine and the hero cult, see e.g. Rohde, *Psyche* (1925), I, 148–150; Pfister, *Der Reliquienkult* (1912), II, 466–478; Habicht, *op. cit.*, 203; Fishwick, *The Imperial Cult in the Latin West* (1987), I 1, 3–4; Parker, *ὡς ἥρωι ἐναγίζειν* (2005), 37–45. However, one has to stress that these differences were not always respected. This was pointed out, among others, by: Pfister, *op. cit.*, 478–480; Nock, *The Cult of Heroes* (1944), 141–148, reprint in *idem*, *Essays* (1972), II, 576–582; van Straten, *Did the Greeks Kneel before their Gods?* (1974), 187–189; Price, *Rituals and Power* (1984), 32–33; Ekroth, *The Sacrificial Rituals* (2002), *passim*, esp. 330–334.

kings and euergetism was considered a trait of the Hellenistic monarch.¹²² That is why many Greeks thought it right and fitting that the benefactor king (βασιλεὺς εὐεργέτης) deserved a divine cult,¹²³ even though there undoubtedly existed a clear distinction between the immortal Olympian gods and very mortal monarchs.¹²⁴ This can be plainly seen on inscriptions stating that someone is worshipped like a god (ὥσπερ θεός) or received honours similar to those of gods (ισόθιοι τιμαί).¹²⁵ Attic inscriptions refer to An-

122 On βασιλεὺς εὐεργέτης see e.g. Schwartz, *Hekataeos von Teos* (1885), 254–260; Skard, *Zwei religiös-politische Begriffe: Euergetes-Concordia* (1932), 56–65; Bolkestein, *Wohltätigkeit und Armenpflege* (1939), 391–400; Kötting *Euergetes* (1966), 849–856; Murray, *Hecataeus of Abdera* (1970), 159–161; Gauthier, *Les cités grecques et leur bienfaiteurs* (1985), 39–53; Ma, *Antiochus III* (1999), 194–228; Bringmann, *Der König als Wohltäter* (1993), 83–95 or *The King as Benefactor* (1993), 7–24; Bringmann, *Geben und Nehmen* (2000). On the ideal of the Hellenistic monarch, see e.g. Goodenough, *The Political Philosophy* (1928), 55–102; Schubart, *Das hellenistische Königsideal* (1937), 1–26; Préaux, *L'image du roi* (1976), 53–75; Gehrke, *Der stiegreiche König* (1982), 247–277; Walbank, *Monarchies and Monarchic Ideas* (1984), 81–84; Virgilio, *Lancia, diadema e porpora* (2003), 47–85 ('Re ideale e re reale'). Schmitt, *Herrscherideal* (2005), 439–442.

123 Habicht, *Gottmenschentum* (1970), 213–221, tries to prove that rejecting such cults for monarchs was generally politically motivated. Cf. Taeger, *Zum Kampf gegen den antiken Herrscherkult* (1935), 282–292.

124 E.g. Schubart, *Die religiöse Haltung* (1937), 18; Habicht, *Gottmenschentum* (1970), 196–199. Compare with the definition of man as *mortalis deus* (Cic. *Fin.* II 40 = Arist. *Protr.* fr. 10 c p. 42 Ross = fr. 832 Gigon). See Dörrie, *Gottesvorstellung* (1983), 136–138. Official propaganda tried to overcome the contradiction between divinity and mortality. Poets associated with the Ptolemaic court declared in their poetry that monarchs did not die but were transferred to the world of the gods. Berenice was abducted by Aphrodite (Theocr. 17, 48), and Arsinoe by the Dioscuri (Callim. fr. 228 Pfeiffer = fr. 122 Asper). See Rohde, *Psyche* (1925), I, 374–376; Pfeiffer, *Arsinoe in der Dichtung* (1926), 161–174; Wilcken, *Zur Entstehung des hellenistischen Königskultes* (1938), 298–321, reprint in Wlosok (Hrsg.), *Römischer Kaiserkult* (1978), 218–253, esp. 241–242. Official documents also used euphemisms in reference to death (e.g. διαλλάσσειν, μεταλλάσσειν, μεθίστασθαι) which suggested that rulers departed earth to lead a different, divine existence. E.g. a decree from Kanopos speaks of Berenice, the daughter of Ptolemy III as ἐπεὶ εἰς θεοὺς μετέλθεν (OGIS 56, 55). Cf. IG XII 2, 645; Diod. XVIII 4, 1; XVIII 56, 2. See Kornemann, *Zur Geschichte der antiken Herrscherkulte* (1901), 60–61, 98 with n. 2; Welles, *Royal Correspondance* (1934), 348; Taylor, *The Divinity* (1931), 25, n. 61; Taeger, *Charisma* (1957), I, 230 with n. 25; Habicht, *Gottmenschentum* (1970), 199–200.

125 See e.g. SEG 41, 75. H. Hepding ap. Nilsson, *Geschichte* (1988), II, 140–141 noted that: 'ισόθεος ebenso wenig göttlich wie ἰσολύμπιος olympisch bedeutet und dass die so genannte Apotheose Lebender noch keine wirkliche Apotheose war, dass man vielmehr so weit ging, schon zu Lebzeiten des Geehrten ihm Ehren zu beschließen, wie man sie früher den Verstorbenen zugebilligt hatte, Ehren, die an sich nicht besagten, dass der Geehrte selber schon ein Gott, sondern nur dass er ἰσόθεος war.' Also see Price, *Gods and Emperors* (1984), 88; Fishwick, *The Imperial Cult* (1987), I 1, 33–35; Chaniotis, *La divinité mortelle* (2007), 153–171. Already in the

tigonus Monophthalmus and his son Demetrius Poliorcetes as kings, and they are only called saviours (σωτήρες) in the context of the cults. The rulers themselves participate in the cults of the Olympian gods, just like other Greeks, while their statues were erected in the temples of other gods, so that this way they became σύνναοι θεοί.¹²⁶ Subjects frequently offered sacrifices for (ὕπέρ) their rulers.¹²⁷ It seems to me that the concept of euergetism was an important factor in the emergence of the ruler cult and it most probably also had a strong influence on Euhemerus.

C. Rationalistic interpretation of myths

Towards the end of the 6th century BC some writers started believing that myths described real events and therefore excluded from them elements they considered miraculous or implausible (θαυμάσια, παράδοξα, ἄπιστα) in order to get to the historic core.¹²⁸ Although this approach essentially concerned tales about heroes, sometimes it was also applied to certain myths concerning gods. This treatment of myths was most probably initiated by the logographer Hecataeus of Miletus in his work Γενεαλογία. For him the three-headed Cerberus, whom Heracles abducted from Hades, was in reality a venomous snake that had lived near Taenarum. This snake was called Hades' dog on account of how many people had died from its bite.¹²⁹ Geryon was not a giant with three bodies but a king whom Heracles had defeated at Epirus with the help of the Epians.¹³⁰ Similar interpretations of myths were later given by, among others, Hellanicus of Mytilene (5th century),¹³¹ Herodorus of Heraclea Pontica (c. 400)¹³² and Palaephatus

epic poetry of Homer words such as ισόθεος, ἀντίθεος, θεοειδής, θεοείκελος are used and should be interpreted metaphorically. Cf. Taeger, *Charisma* (1957), I, 59; Roloff, *Gottähnlichkeit* (1970), 3–37.

126 See Nock, ΣΥΝΝΑΟΣ ΘΕΟΣ (1930), 1–62, reprint in *idem*, *Essays* (1972), I, 202–251; Price, *Between Man and God* (1980), 31–33.

127 Schubart, *Die religiöse Haltung* (1937), 18. Habicht, *op.cit.*, 196, n. 20, admittedly states that the Syracusans prayed to Dion (Plut. *Dion* 29, 1; 46, 1) and the Athenians to Demetrius (Duris FGrHist 76 F 13, 20 ff.), but please note the comments of Fishwick, *The Imperial Cult* (1987), I 1, 37–38. Also see Price, *Gods and Emperors* (1984), 91–93 (testimonies from the time of the Roman Empire); Clauss, *Kaiser und Gott* (1999), 21.

128 See e.g. Wipprecht, *Zur Entwicklung der rationalistischen Mythendeutung* (1902–1908); Nestle, *Vom Mythos zum Logos* (1942), 131–152.

129 Hecat. Mil. FGrHist I F 27 ap. Paus. III 25, 4.

130 Hecat. Mil. FGrHist I F 25 ap. Str. VIII 3, 9 p. 341 and F 26 ap. Arrian. *Anab.* II 16, 5.

131 Hellanic. FGrHist 4 F 28 ap. *Schol. B Hom. Il.* XXI 242 (IV 264 Dindorf) [Achilles' fight with Scamander].

132 Herodot. FGrHist 31 F 63 bis = fr. **52 A Fowler (the dragon guarding the golden fleece was a giant snake).

(4th century).¹³³ This led to the desacralisation of myths¹³⁴ and allowed for myths regarding the Olympian gods also be viewed as historical events.

D. The Sophistic movement

In the second half of the 5th century Sophists and philosophers started becoming interested in the origins of religion. The satyr play Σίσυφος, attributed to Euripides or, more probably, to Critias of Athens,¹³⁵ mentions a wise man convincing others of the existence of heavenly gods punishing people who surreptitiously commit evil deeds. Gods are therefore of human creation, and religion is a tool for maintaining social order.¹³⁶ We find two more theories in the writings of Democritus of Abdera:¹³⁷ a) the origins of belief in gods were giant, alarming and humanlike images (εἰδωλα) that terrified people,¹³⁸ b) wise men (λόγιοι ἄνθρωποι), observing natural phenomena that generally inspired fear and awe, came to the conclusion that there were deities in heaven,

133 See e.g. Festa, *Palaephatus* (1902), XXXII-LII; von Blumenthal, *Palaiphatos* (1942), 2451–2455; Nestle, *Vom Mythos zum Logos* (1942), 148–151; Osmun, *Palaephatus* (1956); Jacoby, *FGrHist I a* (1957), 556–559; Stern, *Palaephatus* (1996), esp. 1–25; Stern, *Rationalizing Myth* (1999), 215–222; Santoni, *Palefato* (2000), esp. 9–42; Brodersen, 'Das aber ist eine Lüge!' – Zur rationalistischen Mythenkritik (2005), 44–57; Berdozzo, *Götter, Mythen* (2011), 32–34..

134 Cf. Bremmer, *Manteis, Magic, Mystery and Mythography* (2010), 29–30 'Nevertheless, we must not fail to note that these rationalising changes also would have contributed to the secularisation of the inherited mythological tradition.'

135 Critias: DK 88 B 25 = TrGF 43 F 19 ap. Sext. Emp. *Adv. math.* IX 54; Euripides: Aët. *Plac.* I 7, 2 p. 298 Diels ap. Ps.-Plut. *Plac. phil.* 880 EF. Dihle, *Das Satyrspiel 'Sisyphos'* (1977), 28–42 was the first to question Critias' authorship and attributed it to Euripides. Some scholars accepted this view, e.g. Mette, *Euripides* (1976), 67–70; Mette, *Euripides* (1981/82), 238–241; Scodel, *The Trojan Trilogy* (1980), 122–137; Yunis, *The Debate* (1988), 39–46; Kahn, *Greek Religion* (1997), 249; Lämmle, *Das Satyrspiel* (2011) 660–661, but others rightly rejected it, including: Solmsen, *Isis* (1979), 130, n. 25; Sutton, *Critias* (1981), 33–38; Winiarczyk, *Nochmals das Satyrspiel* (1987), 35–45; Demandt, *Der Idealstaat* (1993), 56; Graf, *Greek Mythology* (1993), 191; Mansfeld, *Aspects of Epicurean Theology* (1993), 184; Kannicht, *Zum Corpus* (1996), 26–27; Obbink, *Philodemus* (1996), 355; Runia, *Atheists* (1996), 554; Kannicht, *TrGF* (2004), V, 659. The problem of authorship is discussed by: Davies, *Sisyphus* (1989), 24–28; Hoffmann, *Das Recht* (1997), 273–274; Pechstein, *Euripides Satyrographos* (1998), 289–302; Cipolla, *Poeti* (2003), 247–268; Scholten, *Die Sophistik* (2003), 238–241.

136 On the so-called Critias theory, see works cited in: Winiarczyk, *Bibliographie* (1994), 73–77 as well as n. 135 above. Naturally, we do not know whether Critias actually shared the view expressed by the character in the play.

137 On the theories of Democritus, see e.g. Henrichs, *Two Doxographical Notes* (1975), 93–106; Montano, *La genesi della credenza* (1984), 365–390 as well as works cited in Winiarczyk, *Bibliographie* (1994), 32–34.

138 Democr. DK 68 B 166 ap. Sext. Emp. *Adv. math.* IX 19.

ruling the world.¹³⁹ However, the greatest similarity to the views of Euhemerus may be found in a theory by the Sophist Prodicus of Ceos (c. 470 – after 400). In his opinion, religion emerged out of a feeling of gratitude. He saw two stages in the development of religiosity.¹⁴⁰ At first people worshipped as gods things that helped them in life, e.g. the sun, the moon, rivers, lakes, springs, meadows and fruits of the earth. Later they started worshipping people who had invented useful things, such as Demeter, Dionysus, Hephaestus.¹⁴¹ Gods were therefore deified benefactors (εὐεργέται). We know that among those who subscribed to Prodicus' theory was the Stoic philosopher Persaeus, a student of Zeno of Citium and author of the work *Περὶ θεῶν*, who resided at the court of the Macedonian King Antigonos Gonatas from 277/276.¹⁴² It cannot be ruled out that Euhemerus knew this theory. Nevertheless, it seems to me that it would be better to speak of the general influence of the Sophistic movement, as it did try to explain the question of how belief in gods came about.

E. The origins of the commander and ruler cult in the 5th and 4th centuries BC

a. Lysander, Spartan commander (d. 395 r.)¹⁴³

The historian Duris of Samos (c. 340–270) wrote in his *Ἱστορίαι* that, after defeating Athens in the Peloponnesian War, the Spartan commander Ly-

139 Democr. DK 68 B 30 ap. Cl. Al. *Protr.* VI 68, 5; cf. DK 68 A 75 ap. Sext. Emp. *Adv. math.* IX 24.

140 On the views of Prodicus, see e.g. Nestle, *Die Horen des Prodikos* (1936), 160–163, reprint in *idem, Griechische Studien* (1948), 415–420; *Vom Mythos zum Logos* (1942), 353–355; Untersteiner, *I sofisti* (1967), II, 16–18, 30–33; Guthrie, *A History* (1969), III, 238–242; Henrichs, *Two Doxographical Notes* (1975), 107–123; Gallistl, *Teiresias in den Bakchen* (1979), 49–52; Henrichs, *The Atheism of Prodicus* (1976), 15–21; Scholten, *Die Sophistik* (2003), 136–143.

141 Cic. *Nat. deor.* I 118; Philod. *P. Herc.* 1428, col. II 28–III 13 (ed. Henrichs, *CronErc* 4, 1974, 13–14 = *De piet.* p. 75–76 Gomperz = p. 117 Schober); Min. Fel. *Oct.* 21, 2; Sext. Emp. *Adv. math.* IX 18, 52. On the so-called Prodicus' Euhemerism, see Nestle, *Bemerkungen zu den Vorsokratikern* (1908), 556–558; Kleingünther, ΠΡΩΤΟΣ ΕΥΡΕΤΗΣ (1933), 111 with n. 27; Deichgräber, *Persaios* (1937), 928; Pohlenz, *Die Stoa* (1948–1949), I 96–97, II 55; Thraede, *Erfinder* (1962), 1220; Henrichs, *Two Doxographical Notes* (1975), 115–121; Winiarczyk, *Der erste Atheistenkatalog* (1976), 38–39; Rusten, *Dionysius Scytobrachion* (1982), 102–105; Henrichs, *The Sophists* (1984), 140–152. A different view is held by Effe, *Προτρέψη γενεῆς* (1970), 177–180.

142 Persaeus (SVF I 448) ap. Cic. *Nat. deor.* I 38 et Philod. *P. Herc.* 1428 (see n. 141 above); Min. Fel. *Oct.* 21, 2. See chapter VIII 1 D.

143 On the cult of Lysander, see Taeger, *Charisma* (1957), I, 161–164; Lotze, *Lysander* (1964), 52–56; Habicht, *Gottmenschentum* (1970), 3–7, 243–244, 271; Versnel, *Herrschercultus* (1974), 137–138; Badian, *The Deification* (1981), 33–38 (honours awarded to Lysander after his death); Bommelaer, *Lysandre* (1981), 16–17; Fredricksmeier, *On the Background* (1981), 151–152; Walbank, *Könige als Götter* (1987), 372–373; Fears, *Herrscherkult* (1988), 1051–1052; Nilsson, *Geschichte* (1988), 139–141; Mari, *Il 'culto della personalità' a Samo* (2004), 177–183; Muccioli, *Il culto del sovrano* (2011), 118–128.

sander was the most influential person in Greece. That is why the inhabitants of the island of Samos granted him divine honours by erecting altars, offering up sacrifices as to a god (ὥς θεῶν), singing paeans and officially holding the Lysandreia games, which were previously called the Heraia¹⁴⁴. Although Duris did not clearly state that these honours were awarded to Lysander in his lifetime, this is what Plutarch (*Lys.* 18) believed. Perhaps this happened in 404/403, when Lysander returned authority to the exiled oligarchs.¹⁴⁵ Perhaps then the oligarchs expressed their gratitude to the Spartan leader in this way. One has to admit that the credibility of this account has been questioned by some scholars,¹⁴⁶ though their doubts seem unfounded. Even if Duris' ἱστορίαι contain various untrue facts, this certainly does not mean that Duris, who was himself from Samos and for a time (c. 300) even the ruler of the island,¹⁴⁷ would falsify the history of his family polis. An inscription found during an excavation of the Samos Heraion in 1964 confirms the existence of the Lysandreia games.¹⁴⁸ This proved wrong the opinion of Fritz Taeger (1894–1960) that all the information about a Lysander cult was simply invented by Duris. That is also why scholars who argue that towards the end of the 5th century Lysander was the first commander to be deified are probably right.¹⁴⁹ What remains debatable is whether or not the Lysander cult ever spread beyond Samos.¹⁵⁰

Some scholars treated the story of King Agesilaus of Sparta rejecting divine honours the inhabitants of Thasos wished to bestow on him in c. 394¹⁵¹ as evidence of the existence of the Lysander cult. Christian Habicht,

144 Duris FGrHist 76 F 71 ap. Plut. *Lys.* 18, 5–6; cf. F 26 ap. Athen. XV 52, 696 E.

145 Xen. *Hell.* II 3, 6–7.

146 Balsdon, *The Divinity* (1950), 364; Taeger, *op. cit.*, 163–164; Fishwick, *The Imperial Cult* (1987), I 1, 7.

147 See Barron, *The Tyranny of Duris* (1962), 189–192; Meissner, *Historiker* (1992), 285–287; Landucci Gattinoni, *Duride di Samo* (1997), 16–28.

148 Editio princeps: Homann-Wedeking, *Samos* (1965), 440. See Habicht, *op. cit.*, 243–244. Unconvincing is the view held by Badian, *The Deification* (1981), 33–34, that the Λυσάνδρεια festival survived on Samos the 394 anti-Spartan revolution and that it continued to be celebrated until 365.

149 Pfister, *Die Religion der Griechen* (1930), 245; Immisch, *Zum antiken Herrscherkult* (1931), 2; Lotze, *Lysander* (1964), 55; Bengtson, *Griechische Geschichte* (1969), 297; Stewart, *Il culto del sovrano* (1977), 564; Wlosok, *Einführung*, in *eadem* (Hrsg.), *Römischer Kaiserkult* (1978), 3; Hamilton, *The Origins of Ruler-Cult* (1984), 8–9; Momigliano, *How Roman Emperors Became Gods* (1987), 97; Walbank, *Könige als Götter* (1987), 372–373; Cartledge, *Agesilaos* (1987), 83; Bosworth, *Conquest and Empire* (1988), 280; Parker, *Athenian Religion* (1996), 263–264.

150 Although Plut. *Lys.* 18, 5 speaks of πόλεις, only some scholars consider this view to be probable: Charlesworth, *Some Observations on Ruler Cult* (1935), 11; Schäfer, *Alkibiades und Lysimachos* (1949/1950), 306; Hamilton, *On the Perils of Extraordinary Honours* (1979), 87–88; Cartledge, *op. cit.*, 83. Habicht, *Gottmenschentum* (1970), 6–7, is right to say that we cannot verify Plutarch's opinion.

151 Ps.-Plut. *Apophth. Lac.* 210 CD.

however, convincingly argues that this anecdote emerged in a much later period.¹⁵²

b. Dionysius I, tyrant of Syracuse (405–367)

In works on the origins of the ruler cult Dionysius is generally not taken into consideration. It was not until 1991 that Lionel Jehuda Sanders put forward the hypothesis according to which at the start of the 4th century Dionysius, the most powerful Greek ruler of his day, founded his very own cult. What is more, through Dionysius II this cult was to influence the Argead rulers of Macedonia (particularly Philip II), on the one hand, and the tyrants ruling the Black Sea area (Clearchus of Heraclea and Nicagoras of Zeleia), on the other.¹⁵³ Sanders, nevertheless, concedes that there is no concrete evidence of temples, altars, priests or games in honour of Dionysius I. His assumption is based solely on the testimony of Pseudo-Dion of Prusa, which states that there was a statue of Dionysius I with the attributes of the god Dionysus.¹⁵⁴ Franco De Angelis and Benjamin Garstad have recently supported Sanders' theory, but without putting forward any new arguments.¹⁵⁵ Most scholars correctly consider this late testimony to be unreliable.¹⁵⁶ Therefore Sanders' bold theory, based on very tenuous evidence, does not seem sufficiently

152 Habicht, *op. cit.*, 179–184. Similarly Shipley, *A Commentary on Plutarch's Life of Agesilaos* (1997), 214 'This offer is of doubtful authenticity.' Flower, *Agesilaos of Sparta* (1988), 123–134, defended the authenticity of this anecdote and tried to prove that it originated from a work by the historian Theopompus. Also Buraselis, *Apotheose* (2004), 165 considers authentic Plutarch's statement regarding the granting of divine honours to Agesilaus.

153 Sanders, *Dionysius I* (1991), 275–287; *idem*, *From Dionysius to Augustus* (1990/1991), 122–124. Also see J.B. Bury, *CAH VI* (1927), 135 'He (scil. Dionysius) anticipated the custom of deification'.

154 Ps.-Dio Chrys. *Or.* 37, 21.

155 De Angelis, Garstad, *Euhemerus in Context* (2006), 225.

156 Only some scholars consider this to be a credible testimony, e.g. Holm, *Geschichte Siziliens* (1874), II, 459; Niese, *Dionysios* (1903), 903; Pace, *Arte e civiltà della Sicilia* (1938), II, 515–517. The credibility of Ps.-Dion's account has rightly been questioned by Swoboda, *Zur Beurteilung* (1912), 349, n. 3, 'sie (scil. göttliche Verehrung) war höchstens eine Ausschreitung seines Sohnes'; Stroheker, *Dionysios I* (1958), 245, n. 115; Taeger, *Charisma* (1957), I, 166 'Die Nachricht, Dionysios I. seien Standbilder als Dionysos errichtet, ist ohne jedes Gewicht.' Moreover, this evidence was implicitly rejected by those scholars who did not consider Dionysius I to have anything to do with ruler cults. See Muccioli, *I Siracusani* (1997), 113–116, esp. 115 'Resta però in sospeso la questione – di fondamentale importanza – se lo stesso Dionisio I volesse essere rappresentato con gli attributi di Dioniso' and p. 116 'Si tratta comunque di labili indizi, dai quali non si può inferire che ci fosse un *Herrscherkult* sotto Dioniso il Vecchio.' Cf. Muccioli, *Dioniso II* (1999), 471 'L'ipotesi del Sanders, nel suo asserto iniziale, è però difficilmente sostenibile'.

justified. In my opinion the traditional view, according to which Dionysius I was not a precursor of the ruler cult, is correct.

c. Dion of Syracuse¹⁵⁷

When Dion overthrew the tyranny of Dionysius II in 357, the overjoyed inhabitants of Syracuse greeted him as a god.¹⁵⁸ Later Dion lost the support of the people, was deprived of all offices and forced to leave the city. However, the college of 25 στρατηγοί who were appointed to replace him proved to be very incompetent and did nothing to prevent the banished tyrant's army from retaking the city. When these soldiers started looting and murdering citizens, the Syracusans again turned to Dion for help. He then returned from Leontini and again defeated the tyrant. The people this time greeted him as a saviour and a god (σωτήρ καὶ θεός), and appointed him στρατηγὸς αὐτοκράτωρ.¹⁵⁹ Nevertheless, it seems doubtful that a divine cult of Dion was instituted at that stage, since the sources are silent about it.¹⁶⁰ The delighted crowd greeted Dion as a saviour and god only to express their gratitude for his good deeds. However, it is possible that Dion was awarded hero status in 356,¹⁶¹ though it is debatable whether this cult continued to exist after Dion was killed by Callippus in 353.¹⁶²

d. Clearchus, tyrant of Heraclea Pontica (364/363–353/352)¹⁶³

Clearchus was initially a student of Plato and Isocrates, and later became the tyrant of Heraclea. He was to have imitated the lifestyle (διαγωγῇ) of

157 On the cult of Dion, see e.g. Taeger, *Charisma* (1957), I, 153–154; Habicht, *Gottmenschentum* (1970), 8–10, 244–245; Versnel, *Herrschercultus* (1974), 138, 159; Badian, *The Deification* (1981), 42–43; Fredricksmeier, *On the Background* (1981), 152–153; Zahrnt, *Dions Rückkehr aus Leontinoi* (2000), 171–179; Bosworth, *Heroic Honours in Syracuse* (2003), 11–28 (a polemic with Zahrnt, who considered the account of granting the hero cult to be unhistorical). See n. 119 above.

158 Plut. *Dio* 29.

159 Plut. *Dio* 46, 1. The event is described by Diod. XVI 18–20 and Plut. *Dio* 41–48.

160 According to Walbank, *Könige als Götter* (1987), 373; Bosworth, *op. cit.*, 28.

161 Diod. XVI 20, 6 τιμὰς ἀπένευμεν ἡρωικάς. See n. 119 above.

162 Bosworth, *op. cit.*, 28, doubts the Dion cult continues after his death, but in n. 65 on p. 28 he does not rule out the possibility ('Perhaps Callippus relented once Dion was dead, and allowed the heroic honours to continue.').

163 On Clearchus, see Apel, *Die Tyrannis von Heraklea* (1910), 24–41; Weinreich, *Mekrakes Zeus* (1933), 17; Taeger, *Charisma* (1957), I, 164; Mossé, *Un aspect de la crise de la cité* (1962), 6–9; Berve, *Die Tyrannis bei den Griechen* (1967), 315–318, 680–681; Burstein, *Outpost of Hellenism* (1976), 47–65, 125–134; Sanders, *From Dionysius to Augustus* (1990/1991), 117–124; Trampedach, *Platon* (1994), 79–87; Saprykin, *Heracleia Pontica* (1997), 132–141; Bittner, *Gesellschaft und Wirtschaft in Herakleia* (1998), 24–34, Muccioli, *Il culto del sovrano* (2011), 128–130.

Dionysius I, the tyrant of Syracuse.¹⁶⁴ He founded a library and created a cultural centre, which attracted some of the members of Plato's Academy. Moreover, he considered himself to be the son of Zeus and required divine honours from his subjects. Clearchus would appear dressed in a purple robe, wearing a gold wreath on his head, a sceptre or lightning in his hand, and cothurni on his feet. He ordered to have the golden eagle of Zeus carried before him and his youngest son he called Keraunos (lightning). In the end he was murdered.¹⁶⁵ Stanley Mayer Burstein believed Clearchus wanted to create a new form of relationship with his subjects which would strengthen his political authority.¹⁶⁶ Ernst A. Fredricksmeier considered the tyrant's acquisition of divine honours to be probable, whereas Gaetano De Sanctis (1870–1957) and Hermann Bengtson (1909–1989) saw in Clearchus a true precursor of Alexander the Great.¹⁶⁷

e. Nicagoras, tyrant of Zeleia (to 334)¹⁶⁸

Nicagoras was the tyrant of Zeleia, in Mysia, who was removed from power by Alexander the Great after the battle at Granicus in 334. He considered himself to be Hermes. That is why he wore the god's chlamys as well as winged shoes, and in his hand he held the caduceus (κερυκεῖον).¹⁶⁹ He belonged to the divine choir (θεῖος χορός) of the Syracusan physician Menecrates.¹⁷⁰ Otto Weinreich (1886–1972) assumed that in his memoirs or letters Nicagoras wrote of himself as Hermes (see n. 168).

164 Diod. XV 81, 5.

165 Iust. XVI 5, 8–11; Plut. *Alex. M. fort. aut virt.* 5, 338 B; Memnon (FGrHist 434 F 1) ap. Phot. *Bibl.* 224 p. 222 b; Ael. fr. 86 Hercher = fr. 89 Domingo-Forasté ap. Sudam s.v. Κλέαρχος (III 126–127 Adler).

166 Burstein, *Outpost of Hellenism* (1976), 62–63. Similarly Trampedach, *Platon* (1994), 84.

167 Fredricksmeier, *On the Background* (1981), 153; De Sanctis, *Gli ultimi messaggi di Alessandro* (1940), 10, 13 (he accepts that Clearchus was influenced by the Orient); Bengtson, *Griechische Geschichte* (1969), 297. Of a different opinion is Trampedach, *op. cit.*, 84, n. 174, but his opinion is based on a false assumption. His argument is that while the cult of Lysander on Samos and that of Philip II in Amphipolis were expressions of gratitude from the inhabitants, Clearchus was hated by his subjects and especially by the aristocracy. However, Trampedach does not take into account that there were two types of the ruler cult: ones instituted by the *polis* and ones instituted by the rulers themselves.

168 On Nicagoras, see Weinreich, *Menekrates* (1933), 11, 98; Taeger, *Charisma* (1957), I, 165; Berve, *Die Tyrannis* (1967), I, 314; Sanders, *Dionysius* (1991), 283; Heckel, *Who's Who in the Age of Alexander* (2009), 175–176.

169 Baton (FGrHist 268 F 2) ap. Athen. VII 33, 289 C; Cl. Al. *Protr.* IV 54, 4.

170 On Menecrates' circle, see Weinreich, *op. cit.*, 9–19; Winiarczyk, *Die hellenist. Utopien* (2011), 206–207; Squillace, *Menecrate* (2012) 41–46. Although Menecrates (4th

f. Philip II, king of Macedonia (359–336)¹⁷¹

The cult of Philip II was instituted in Amphipolis in 359 after the withdrawal of the Macedonian garrison, which was interpreted as the regaining of independence.¹⁷² This could have been the democratic faction's expression of gratitude, but Christian Habicht states that one cannot rule out a different reason.¹⁷³ Up to 334 there were altars to Zeus Philippios in Eresus on the island of Lesbos.¹⁷⁴ When the Athenians were treated with leniency after their defeat at Chaeronea in 338, the Macedonian ruler was praised as a god (προσκυνεῖν) at Kynosarges, where there was a sanctuary of Heracles, an ancestor of the Argead dynasty.¹⁷⁵ Many scholars, however, doubt the credibility of this account passed on to us by Clement of Alexandria.¹⁷⁶ It was probably that same year Philip II began constructing in the form of a tholos the so-called Philippeion near the sanctuary of Hera in Olympia.¹⁷⁷ Accord-

century BC) considered himself to be Zeus, more is not written here about this physician because he was not a politician. See Muccioli, *Un medico che si credeva Zeus* (2000), 403–413; Squillace, *Le lettere di Menecrate/Zeus* (2004), 175–191.

- 171 On the cult of Philip II, see Taeger, *Charisma* (1957), I, 172–178; Habicht, *Gottmenschentum* (1970), 12–16, 245; Prestianni Giallombardo, ΦΙΛΙΠΠΙΚΑ (1975), 1–57; Fredricksmeyer, *Divine Honors for Philip* (1979), 39–61; *idem*, *On the Background* (1981), 146–147; *idem*, *On the Final Aims of Philip* (1982), 85–98, esp. 94 ff.; Badian, *The Deification* (1981), 39–42, 67–71 (polemic with Fredricksmeyer); Walbank, *Könige als Götter* (1987), 373–374; Momigliano, *Filippo il Macedone* (1987), 173–177; Schumacher, *Zum Herrschaftsverständnis Philipps II.* (1990), 426–443; Damaskos, *Untersuchungen zu hellenistischen Kultbildern* (1999), 263–266; Worthington, *Philip II* (2008), 228–233.

- 172 Ael. Arist. *Or.* 9, 14 p. 632 Lenz.

- 173 Habicht, *op. cit.*, 13.

- 174 OGIS 8 a = Tod, GHI 191, 5–6. There are two possible interpretations for the cult name Ζεὺς Φιλίππιος: a) Zeus was Philip's specific guardian – Taeger, *op. cit.*, 174; Fredricksmeyer, *Divine Honors* (1979), 51; Walbank, *Könige als Götter* (1987), 373; Nilsson, *Geschichte* (1988), II, 142 'Philipp ist selbst nicht vergöttert, sondern Zeus zu seinem besonderen Beschützer gemacht worden'; Badian, *Alexander the Great* (1996), 13, b) Zeus had acted through Philip to remove tyranny from Eresus – Schwabl, *Zeus* (1978), 1401; Schumacher, *Zum Herrschaftsverständnis Philipps* (1990), 437–438; cf. Buraselis, *Apotheose* (2004), 166.

- 175 Cl. Al. *Protr.* IV 54, 5.

- 176 Habicht, *op. cit.*, 13; Badian, *The Deification* (1981), 67–71; Nilsson, *op. cit.*, 142; Parker, *Athenian Religion* (1996), 257 with n. 4. Only some scholars accept this tradition, e.g. Taylor, *The Divinity* (1931), 12; Fredricksmeyer, *Divine Honors* (1979), 47–50. On the other hand, Versnel, *Philipp II and Kynosarges* (1973), 273–279, proposed a quite unconvincing interpretation according to which the Athenians played a joke on Philip by erecting his statue at Kynosarges, where there was a gymnasium for νόθοι and a club for 60 jokers convened (Athen. XIV 3, 614 DE). See Bremmer, *Ἐς Κυνόσαργες* (1977), 369–374.

- 177 Paus. V 20, 9–10; cf. V 17, 4. On the Philippeion, see Schleif, Zschieztzschmann, *Das Philippeion* (1944), 1–52; Mallwitz, *Olympia* (1972), 128–133; Miller, *The Philip-*

ing to Pausanias,¹⁷⁸ in this tholos there were five chryselephantine statues by Leochares: of Philip, his parents Amyntas and Eurydice, his son Alexander and his wife Olympias, whom Philip had actually divorced in 337 but whose statue Alexander installed after his father's death. The chryselephantine technique was reserved for the statues of gods and that is why according to some scholars Philip wanted to create at the Philippeion a centre for his dynasty's cult.¹⁷⁹ It seems that Alexander did not continue his father's plan

peion (1973), 189–218; Seiler, *Die griechische Tholos* (1986), 89–103; Hintzen-Bohlen, *Die Familiengruppe* (1990), 131–134; *eadem*, *Herrscherrepräsentation* (1992), 26–29; Huwendiek, *Zur Interpretation des Philippeion* (1996), 155–159; Carney, *The Philippeum* (2007), 27–60; Worthington, *Philip II* (2008), 164–166. Badian, *The Deification* (1981), 71, was uncertain as to whether the expression Φιλίππῳ δὲ ἐποιήθη (Paus. V 20, 10) means the construction of the Philippeion was initiated by Philip II himself, because the translation 'by Philip' is contrary to 'Pausanias' usual style'. The dative in the work of the perieget is generally translated as 'for someone'. Badian, nevertheless, conceded that the traditional translation is possible. This expert's great authority meant that other scholars started having doubts as to how to interpret Pausanias' text ('for Philip' or 'by Philip'). E.g. Ameling, *'...Et dona ferentes'* (1987), 18 with n. 24; Bringmann, von Steuben, *Schenkungen* (1995), 404; Schmidt-Dounas, *Geschenke* (2000), 201; Buraselis, *Apotheose* (2004), 166–167. Such a hypercritical approach, however, seems to be inappropriate.

178 Paus. V 20, 9–10. The exact number and configuration of statues in the Philippeion is controversial. Most scholars accept the hypothesis put forward by Zschietzschmann in *Das Philippeion* (1944), 51, according to which the effigy of Alexander was located in the centre, with Philip and Amyntas and next the statues of the women on either side. Thus, e.g. Mallwitz, *Olympia* (1972), 128; Borbein, *Die griechische Statue* (1973), 66, n. 105; Seiler, *Die griechische Tholos* (1986), 98, n. 411; Hintzen-Bohlen, *Die Familiengruppe* (1990), 131–132; Hitzl, *Drei Beiträge* (1995), 12. Carney, *The Philippeum* (2007), 49 and Schultz, *Leochares' Argead Portraits* (2007), 214–216, on the other hand, believe that Alexander did not alter his father's plan and erected Philip's statue in the centre. Huwendiek, *Zur Interpretation des Philippeion* (1996), 157 maintained that Philip had commissioned only four statues: his own as well as those of his wife Cleopatra and his parents, Amyntas and Eurydice. These effigies were to correspond to the divine couples Zeus and Hera as well as Cronus and Rhea. Also see Schumacher, *Zum Herrschaftsverständnis Philipps* (1990), 439 'daß für das Philippeion ursprünglich nur eine Statue des Herrschers vorgesehen war, erscheint die Vorstellung bestechend, daß es sich um eine Sitzstatue handelt, die Philipp als Hegemon Griechenlands darstellte'. It is worth noting that Pausanias had seen the effigies of the women not in the Philippeion, but in the Heraion. We do not know when these statues were transferred.

179 Thus e.g. Fredricksmeyer, *Alexander's Religion* (2003), 277, n. 111 'It is possible that Philip planned to found a dynastic cult'. Griffith in Hammond, Griffith, *A History of Macedonia* (1979), 692–695 considers the Philippeion to have been a secular building, not a religious one. Similarly e.g. Long, *The Twelve Gods* (1987), 209–210; Carney, *The Philippeum* (2007), 52; Worthington, *Philip II* (2008), 165. According to Seiler, *op. cit.*, 100–101 the Philippeion should be considered 'in seiner Gesamtheit zweifellos als Weihung an Zeus', but he concedes that its significance went well beyond 'über den Gehalt konventioneller Weigeschenke', and its goal

because there are no traces of a cult at the Philippeion. Moreover, one also has to add that according to some scholars the extant bases indicate the statues were carved out of marble, which would mean that Pausanias' information is false.¹⁸⁰

Of interest to us is an event that took place in Aegae in 336, when Philip's daughter was married to Alexander, the king of Epirus. Statues of the twelve Olympian gods were carried during the ceremonial procession held in the theatre and carried with them was also the statue of Philip.¹⁸¹ Although the king was not then deified, he was in a sense elevated to a superhuman sphere, much nearer to the gods.¹⁸² It is interesting that Philip was murdered that very same day. It seems to me that he had been consistently trying to establish his own cult and only sudden death stopped him from achieving this goal.¹⁸³ One cannot rule out that a temple had already been erected for Philip's father Amyntas III in Pydna, where he was worshipped as a god.¹⁸⁴

was 'die glanzvolle Selbstdarstellung der makedonischen Dynastie'. Also see Schumacher, *Zum Herrschaftsverständnis Philipps* (1990), 438–439. It is worth adding that Ptolemy II had chryselephantine statues made of his parents as θεοὶ σωτήρες (Theocr. 17, 121–125).

- 180 E.g. Worthington, *Philip II* (2008), 165 'gilded stone'; Schultz, *Leochares' Argead Portraits* (2007), 205–233; *idem*, *Divine Images* (2009), 152–154. However, Lapatin, *Chryselephantine Statuary* (2001), 115–119; *idem*, *New Statues* (2010), 150–151 accepts Pausanias' account as credible. On the other hand, Hitzl, *Drei Beiträge* (1995), 12, n. 43, believes the statues to have been acroliths. See n. 183 below.

- 181 Diod. XVI 92, 5; Stob. IV 34, 70 (IV 846 Hense). On the procession see Long, *The Twelve Gods* (1987), 209–210.

- 182 According to Taeger, *Charisma* (1957), I, 175 Philip as σύνθρονος ... τοῖς δώδεκα θεοῖς was 'noch nicht vergottet, aber in die göttliche Sphäre ... emporgehoben'. Similarly Schumacher, *Zum Herrschaftsverständnis Philipps* (1990), 435, and Bosworth, *Alexander* (1994), 871–872. Nilsson, *Geschichte* (1988), II, 142, is wrong to play down this event. Cf. Ellis, *Macedonian Hegemony Created* (1994), 789 'But a story ... is more likely the invention of later moralists seeking to rationalize what followed'.

- 183 A different view is held by Badian, *The Deification* (1981), 39–42; Fears, *Herrscherkult* (1988), 1053. Worthington, *Philip II* (2008), 165, 'Philip was mistakenly thought to have been seeking his own divinity'. According to Schumacher, *op. cit.*, 442 'resultierte die Zeus-Assimilation Philipps (scil. in der Münzprägung) nicht aus dem Wunsch nach Vergottung oder kultischen Ehren, sondern stand im Dienste machtpolitischer Propaganda', cf. pp. 440–441. Also see Damaskos, *Untersuchungen* (1999), 266, n. 51, 'Es kann nicht ausgeschlossen werden, daß sein frühzeitiger Tod seine weiteren Pläne vereitelt hat'; Schultz, *Divine Images* (2009), 154 'This conclusion that Leochares' Argead portraits were gilded and/or heavily painted marble ... need not affect the hypotheses that Philip and his family were shown in heroic or divine guise'.

- 184 Ael. Arist. *Or.* 9, 14 Lenz; *Schol. Dem. Olynth.* 1, 5 (I 26 Dilts). Thus Habicht, *Gottmenschen* (1970), 11–12; Fredricksmeyer, *On the Background* (1981), 154; Walbank, *Könige als Götter* (1987), 373. This testimony has been rejected by Tae-

g. Alexander III the Great (336–323)¹⁸⁵

Even in his lifetime the Greek cities of Asia Minor established a cult to Alexander in gratitude for liberating them from Persian rule.¹⁸⁶ After his return from India, in the winter of 324/323, Alexander requested the cities of the League of Corinth to honour him as a god.¹⁸⁷ However, we do not know where and in which form he expressed this wish.¹⁸⁸ The sources speak of Alexander being declared a god in Athens¹⁸⁹ and Sparta.¹⁹⁰ Perhaps it was then that the Alexandria games were introduced on the island of Thasos, which also belonged to the League of Corinth.¹⁹¹ In the spring of 323 θεωροί, i.e. envoys regarding religious matters, arrived in Babylon to honour Alexander as a god and offer him golden wreaths.¹⁹² Nevertheless, one has to concede

ger, *Charisma* (1957), I, 174 and Badian, *The Deification* (1981), 39. Schumacher, *op. cit.*, 437 thinks this was rather ‘ein postumes Heroon für den bereits 369/8 verstorbene Amyntas’.

- 185 On the cult of Alexander, see Wilcken, *Zur Entstehung des hellenistischen Königs-kultes* (1938), in Wlosok, *Römischer Kaiserkult* (1978), 218–229; De Sanctis, *Gli ultimi messaggi di Alessandro* (1940), 1–21; Tarn, *Alexander* (1948), II, 347–373; Balsdon, *The ‘Divinity’ of Alexander* (1950), 363–388; Taeger, *op. cit.*, I, 215–224; *idem*, *Alexanders Gottkönigs-gedanke* (1959), 394–406; Habicht, *op. cit.*, 17–36, 225–229, 246–250; Bickerman, *Sur un passage d’Hypéride* (1963), 70–85; Seibert, *Alexander* (1972), 192–206, 302–305; Schachermeyer, *Alexander* (1973), 525–531; Atkinson, *Demosthenes, Alexander* (1973), 310–335; Fredricksmeyer, *Three Notes on Alexander’s Deification* (1979), 1–9; Badian, *The Divinity* (1981), 44–66; Hamilton, *The Origins of Ruler-Cult* (1984), 11–15; Fishwick, *The Imperial Cult* (1987), I 1, 8–11; Bosworth, *Conquest and Empire* (1988), 278–290; Cawkwell, *The Deification of Alexander* (1994), 293–306; Badian, *Alexander* (1996), 11–26; Fredricksmeyer, *Alexander’s Religion and Divinity* (2003), 253–278, esp. 274–278; Buraselis, *Apotheose* (2004), 167–171; Ferrandini Troisi, *La divinizzazione di Alessandro* (2005), 23–34; Dreyer, *Heroes, Cults, and Divinity* (2009), 218–234.

- 186 See Habicht, *Gottmenschentum* (1970), 17–25.

- 187 *Ael. Var. hist.* II 19.

- 188 In 324 Nicanor read out to the Greeks gathered in Olympia Alexander’s instructions, according to which cities of the League of Corinth were to receive the political exiles (Diod. XVIII 8). There is a tempting hypothesis that this was when the Greeks were told of Alexander’s wishes regarding deification but this cannot be proved. Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, *Der Glaube der Hellenen* (1932), II, 267, rightly noted that Alexander’s cult ‘mit der alten hellenischen Anschauung vereinbar war: der κρείττων ward zum Gotte. Wenn diese Überlegenheit vorhanden war, ist die Prädizierung als Gott verständlich und erträglich’. A similar view is held by Charlesworth, *Some Observations on Ruler Cult* (1935), 13.

- 189 *Ael. Var. hist.* V 12; Athen. VI 58, 251 B.

- 190 *Ael. Var. hist.* II 19; Ps.-Plut. *Apophth. Lac.* 219 E.

- 191 Thus Habicht, *Gottmenschentum* (1970), 251–252, though the first editor of the inscription had in mind a cult that was founded only after Alexander’s death (Salviat, *Une nouvelle loi Thasienne* [1958], 193–267, esp. 244–248).

- 192 Arrian. *Anab.* VII 23, 2. Scholars disagree as to the interpretation of the words ὡς θεωροί δῆθεν, e.g. Fredricksmeyer, *Three Notes* (1979), 3–5, 8, and Badian, *The*

that some scholars question the tradition of Alexander receiving divine honours.¹⁹³ P.M. Fraser believed that even if it was true, this did not mean an official cult of the king and his family was then established, i.e. there were no official temples or priests. At most Alexander's name was added to the invocations and prayers offered up to the gods of a particular polis. Such scepticism, however, does not seem justified. Indeed, not all the testimonies provide reliable information. For instance, it is unlikely that Alexander would have been identified as Dionysus,¹⁹⁴ or considered the thirteenth god (θεὸς τρισκαίδεκατος) in Athens.¹⁹⁵ Likewise the vocabulary used by some of the authors is anachronistic.¹⁹⁶ Moreover, we do not know Alexander's motives or the circumstances in which he expressed his desire to be deified. Nor do we know the form of this cult. Yet despite all this, there can be no doubt that in Athens and perhaps also in Sparta the problem of granting Alexander divine honours was discussed.¹⁹⁷ After his death, when the Lamian War broke out, this cult most probably ceased to exist.

Ptolemy I established an official Alexander cult in Alexandria, but it was most probably not before the reign of Ptolemy II that Alexander's body was brought to the city from Memphis. We know there was a cult in 289/288 that had not yet existed in 311.¹⁹⁸

Alexander's visit (in the winter of 332/331) to oracle of Ammon in the oasis at Siwah, who greeted him as the son of Zeus, as well as the attempt to introduce προσκύνησις in Bactria in the spring of 327 fall beyond the scope of this book.

Deification (1981), 56–59, but a sensible solution was already proposed by Habicht, *op. cit.*, 247–248. Cf. Hamilton, *The Origins* (1984), 12.

193 Balsdon, *The Divinity* (1950), 383–388; Bickerman, *Sur un passage* (1963) 70–85; Fishwick, *The Imperial Cult* (1987), I 1, 8–11; Fears, *Herrscherkult* (1988), 1054; Cawkwell, *The Deification* (1994), 293–306.

194 Diogenes Sinop. (SSR V B 36) ap. Diog. Laert. VI 63. A good review of literature is found in: Seibert, *Alexander* (1972), 204–206.

195 Ael. *Var. hist.* V 12; Joh. Chrys. *In epist. 2 ad Cor. hom.* 26, 4 (PG 61, 580).

196 E.g. Ael. *Var. hist.* II 19 ἐκθεῶω, θεὸν ψηφίζεσθαι. For more on the terminology used in the establishing of a divine cult, see Habicht, *Gottmenschentum* (1970), 171–179.

197 Hyper. *C. Dem.* fr. 8, col. 31; Dinarch. *C. Dem.* 1, 94; Timaeus (FGrHist 566 F 155) ap. Polyb. XII 12 b, 3; *Gnom. Vat.* 236; Val. Max. VII 2 ext. 13; Plut. *Praec. ger. rei publ.* 8, 804 B; Ps.-Plut., *Vit. X orat.* 842 D. Thus Will, *Athen und Alexander* (1983), 120 with n. 144–148; Parker, *Athenian Religion* (1996), 257; Worthington, *Hyperides* (2001), 129–131; Dreyer, *Heroes* (2009), 230.

198 See Plaumann, *Probleme des alexandrinischen Alexanderkultes* (1920), 77–99; Visser, *Götter und Kulte* (1938), 8–12; Wilcken, *Zur Entstehung* (1938), 231, reprint in Wlosok, *Römischer Kaiserkult* (1978), 231–233, 235–237; Fraser, *Ptolemaic Alexandria* (1972), I, 216–217; Leschhorn, 'Gründer der Stadt' (1984), 204–212; Müller, *Das hellenistische Königspaar* (2009), 247–251. One should remember that in Alexandria there were two distinct Alexander cults. He was worshipped as a god but also as the founder of the city. Also see Grimm, *Die Vergöttlichung Alexanders des Grossen in Ägypten* (1978), 103–112.

h. Summary

The Spartan commander Lysander (d. 395) was the first person to be worshipped as a god in his own lifetime. This occurred on Samos in 404/403, and the cult was probably limited to this island only. On the other hand, it is doubtful the inhabitants of the island of Thasos had actually granted divine honours to the Spartan King Agesilaus in c. 394. Moreover, it is quite improbable that Dionysius I, the tyrant of Syracuse in the years 405–367, created his own cult. After the overthrowing of the tyranny of Dionysius II in Syracuse in 357, Dion was only granted the honours of a hero. The tradition of Black Sea area tyrants aspiring to acquire their own divine cults is fairly well testified. Clearchus of Heraclea (d. 353/352) considered himself the son of Zeus, while Nicagoras of Zeleia (who ruled until 334) identified himself as Hermes. It seems to me that Philip II of Macedonia consistently strived to establish a cult of his own person and only sudden death in Aegae in 336 prevented him from achieving this goal. Alexander followed in his father's footsteps, for after the conquest of Persia and India, he expressed the wish for cities belonging to the League of Corinth to start honouring him as a god (324/323).

J.H.W.G. Liebeschuetz¹⁹⁹ is right to point out that up until the end of the 5th century Greek poleis tried to achieve independence thanks to the valour of their citizens and the help of the gods. However, in the 4th century Greeks became increasingly dependent on great rulers and therefore started honouring these rulers as gods, to express gratitude for benefactions and to encourage them to perform benefactions in the future. Eventually divine honours became a conventional means of expressing respect.

Commander and ruler cults were founded on a deep rooted conviction that one could call someone a god if that person had performed good service for an individual, a group of people or an entire society, in other words if that person was a benefactor (εὐεργέτης) or saviour (σωτήρ). This view was already present in the epic poetry of Homer and it was universal in the Hellenistic period as well as the time of the Roman Empire. It stemmed from the conviction that one of the most important attributes of deity was performing good deeds for the benefit of people. A person performing a benefaction became similar to a god. At the start of the Hellenistic period benefactions were primarily performed by kings and euergetism was considered a feature of the Hellenistic monarch. That is why many Greeks thought it fit and proper for a benefactor king (βασιλεὺς εὐεργέτης) to have his own divine

199 Liebeschuetz, *Continuity and Change in Roman Religion* (1979), 67. Nock, ΣΥΝΝΑΟΣ ΘΕΟΣ (1930), 61–62, reprint in: *idem, Essays* (1972), I, 250–251, believed the great authority of the Delphic Oracle in the 6th century had prevented tyrants from aspiring to the creation of their own divine cults.

cult, although without doubt a discernible distinction was made between the immortal Olympian gods and mortal rulers.

F. The ruler cult at the start of the Hellenistic period (up to 270)

a. The Antigonids

In 311 the city of Scepsis in the Troad founded the cult of Antigonus I Monophthalmus. He was then granted his own temenos, altar and cult statue (ἄγαλμα).²⁰⁰ This was an expression of gratitude for making peace with Cassander, Lysimachus and Ptolemy I as well as for guaranteeing freedom for the Greek cities.²⁰¹ In 307, after freeing Athens from Macedonian occupation – at which time Demetrius forced Cassander's garrison to leave the fortress of Munichia in Piraeus – the Athenian assembly declared Antigonus and his son Demetrius Poliorcetes σωτῆρες.²⁰² A priest was appointed²⁰³ and an altar²⁰⁴ or even alters were erected.²⁰⁵ It was decided that new tribes (φύλαι) would be named after them, Antigonis and Demetrias, and that there they would be honoured as eponymous gods.²⁰⁶ Moreover, every year games and processions were to be held in their honour.²⁰⁷ Finally it was passed that their images should be embroidered on a peplos to be offered to Athena

200 OGIS 6, 20–23. See Habicht, *Gottmenschen* (1970), 42–44. On the difference between cult statues (ἄγαλμα) and honorific statues (εἰκών, ἀνδριάς), see Price, *Rituals and Power* (1984), 176–179; Damaskos, *Untersuchungen* (1999), 304–309; Bettinetti, *La statua di culto* (2001), 27–42. Some scholars are of the opinion that Greek terminology does not always allow us to determine whether we are dealing with a cult statue or a votive one. E.g. see Scheer, *Die Gottheit und ihr Bild* (2000), 3–34, esp. 34; Steiner, *Images in Mind* (2001), 80–84, 104; Eich, *Gottesbild* (2011), 49. Also see Donohue, *The Greek Images* (1997), 31–45; Mylonopoulos, *Divine Images* (2010), 1–19.

201 Diod. XIX 105, 1.

202 On the cult of Demetrius, see Scott, *The Deification of Demetrius Poliorcetes* (1928), 137–166, 217–239; Cappellano, *Il fattore politico negli onori divini a Demetrio* (1954); Taeger, *Charisma* (1957), I, 264–273; Habicht, *op. cit.*, 44–55, 255; Kertész, *Bemerkungen zum Kult des Demetrios* (1978), 163–175; Landucci Gattinoni, *La divinizzazione di Demetrio* (1981), 115–123; Weber, *Herrscher, Hof und Dichter* (1995), 295–305; Parker, *Athenian Religion* (1996), 258–262; Mikalson, *Religion in Hellenistic Athens* (1998), 75–104; Henrichs, *Demythologizing the Past* (1999), 243–247; Green, *Delivering the Go(o)ds: Demetrius Poliorcetes* (2003), 258–277. See n. 216 below.

203 Plut. *Dem.* 10, 4; 46, 1.

204 Diod. XX 46, 2.

205 Plut. *Dem.* 12, 4.

206 Plut. *Dem.* 10, 6.

207 Diod. XX 46, 2.

during the Panathenaic procession.²⁰⁸ In 304²⁰⁹ Demetrius was greeted by the Athenians as θεὸς καταβῆτης for successful repelling Cassander's army when it tried to occupy Attica. It was then that he received a temple with an altar²¹⁰ and was allowed to reside in the opisthodomos of the Parthenon.²¹¹ It was also decided that in the future deputies sent to Demetrius would be called θεῶποι, i.e. envoys to a god, and that the king's responses to be treated as oracles.²¹² In 294 Demetrius threw the pro-Macedonian tyrant Lachares out of Athens and restored the democratic constitution.²¹³ What is more, he gave the starving inhabitants ten thousand medimnoi of wheat. It was then that a decree was passed for a votive feast of the sort that were held for Dionysus and Demeter to take place whenever Demetrius visited Athens. The Dionysia festival were henceforth called the Διονύσια καὶ Δημητρίεα,²¹⁴ and the month Munichion now started being called Demetrium.²¹⁵ When Demetrius returned from Corcyra to Athens in 290, he was greeted in a hymn as a god, the son of Poseidon and Aphrodite. The Athenians requested him to aid them in their struggle against the Aetolians because other gods were far away, had no ears or were completely indifferent to their fate.²¹⁶

b. The Lagids

In 304 the Rhodians, out of gratitude for the aid provided during a year-long siege, built for Ptolemy I a temple which was called the Ptolemaion.²¹⁷

208 Plut. *Dem.* 10, 5; 12, 3; Diod. *loc.cit.*

209 Habicht, *op. cit.*, 48–50 convincingly argues that this event could not have already occurred in 307, as Plutarch states (*Dem.* 10, 5). His arguments were wrongly rejected by Taeger, *Charisma* (1957), I, 265–266, n. 71.

210 Plut. *Dem.* 10, 5; Plut. *De Alex. M. fort. aut virt.* II 5, 338 A; Cl. Al. *Protr.* IV 54, 6.

211 Plut. *Dem.* 23, 5.

212 Plut. *De Alex. M. loc.cit.*; Plut. *Dem.* 13.

213 Plut. *Dem.* 34, 5. See Habicht, *Gottmenschentum* (1970), 50–55; *idem*, *Untersuchungen* (1979), 2–8.

214 Although Plutarch (*Dem.* 12, 2) writes that Διονύσια were transformed into Δημητρίεα, Habicht, *Gottmenschentum* (1970), 53, corrects Plutarch's text on the basis of Philippides' decree of 292 (IG II² 1, 649), which speaks of Διονύσια καὶ Δημητρίεα. This emendation has been accepted by Parker, *Athenian Religion* (1996), 259, and Mikalson, *Religion in Hellenistic Athens* (1998), 93.

215 Philochor. (FGrHist 328 F 166) ap. *Schol. Pind. Nem.* 3, 4; Harpocr. s.v. ἔνη καὶ νέα p. 94 Keaney.

216 Duris (FGrHist 76 F 13) ap. Athen. VI 63, 253 D-F. On this hymn, see e.g. *Athenischer Hymnus auf Demetrios* (1931), 279–297; Cerfaux, Tondriaux, *Un concurrent de christianisme* (1957), 180–187; Alfonsi, *Sull' Itifallo di Ermitto (?)* [1963], 161–164; Sommariva, *Il proemio del De rerum natura di Lucrezio e l'inno a Demetrio* (1982), 166–185; Marcovich, *Hermocles' Ithyphallus for Demetrius* (1988), 8–19. Also see n. 202 above.

217 Diod. XX 100, 3–4. See Habicht, *Gottmenschentum* (1970), 109–110.

There he was honoured as Soter²¹⁸ and adored with a paean.²¹⁹ The cult of Ptolemy was also instituted by the Nesiotic League and Miletus.²²⁰ Around the year 280 Ptolemy II deified his father, who had died in 283, by adding the Σωτήρ epithet to his name, building a temple²²¹ and establishing in his honour magnificent games, the Ptolemaia (Ptolemaieia), which were to be held every four years.²²² When Soter's wife, Berenice, died in 279, she was included in the cult and the deceased royal couple was adored as the θεοὶ σωτῆρες.²²³ Berenice was also given a cult of her own, as already in the mid-270s Callixinus mentions a temple to Berenice (the Berenikeion).²²⁴

218 Paus. I 8, 6. Hazzard, *Did Ptolemy I Get His Surname from the Rhodians* (1992), 52–56, doubts the veracity of Pausanias' account. This hypothesis has been rejected by Johnson, *Ptolemy's Epiklesis Σωτήρ* (2000), 102–106.

219 Gorgon (FGrHist 515 F 19) ap. Athen. XV 52, 696 F–697 A.

220 Habicht, *op. cit.*, 111–115.

221 Theoc. 17, 123.

222 SIG I³ 390 ἀγὼν ἰσολύμπιος γυμνικὸς καὶ μουσικὸς. The first three *Ptolemaia* took place in the years 279/278 (SEG 28, 60 v. 55–64), 275/274 and 271/270. Callixinus of Rhodes (FGrHist 627 F 2) ap. Athen. V 27–36, 197 C–203 B) described a great procession which probably took place during the *Ptolemaia*. Callixinus' dating and sources are discussed by Hazzard, *Imagination of a Monarchy* (2000), 62–66. Also see Müller, *Das hellenistische Königspaar* (2009), 176–205. Some scholars believe these were the first *Ptolemaia* (279/278): Perpillou-Thomas, *Fêtes d'Égypte* (1993), 154; Walbank, *Two Hellenistic Processions* (1996), 121, reprint in *idem*, *Polybius* (2002), 81; Thompson, *Philadelphus' Procession* (2000), 381–387, esp. 382 and 387; Wiemer, *Bild der Polis* (2009), 119, n. 11; the second *Ptolemaia* (275/274): Foertmeyer, *The Dating of the Pompe* (1988), 90–104 (was based on astronomical calculations); Hölbl, *Geschichte des Ptolemäerreiches* (1994), 36; Chaniotis, *Sich selbst feiern?* (1995), 162 ('ca. 275/274?'); Dreyer, *Untersuchungen* (1999), 247; Huß, *Ägypten* (2001), 323; the third *Ptolemaia* (271/270): Otto, *Beiträge* (1928), 7–8; Wilcken, *Zur Entstehung* (1938), reprint in Wlosok, *Römischer Kaiserkult* (1978), 238; Volkmann, *Ptolemaia* (1972), 1216; Goukowsky, *Essai sur les origines du mythe d'Alexandre* (1981), II, 81–83; Heinen, *The Syrian-Egyptian Wars* (1984), 417. One should note that Fraser, *Ptolemaic Alexandria* (1972), I 231–232, II 381, n. 335, doubted that the grand procession was associated with the *Ptolemaia*, and his student Rice, *The Grand Procession* (1983), 182–187, discarding the view that the πομπή took place during the *Ptolemaia*, instead believes it happened in the years 279–275. This theory was rejected by H. Maehler, *JEA* 74, 1988, 290–292, who links the procession with the first *Ptolemaia*. Habicht, *Athens and Ptolemies* (1992), 70, n. 10, believes that the *Ptolemaia* were initially part of the funeral ceremony in honour of Ptolemy I. Only later (in 280 or 279) were they converted by Ptolemy II into a festival held every four years. Hazzard, *op. cit.*, 59–79, thinks the procession took place 262, while Pfeiffer, *Herrscher- und Dynastiekulte* (2008), 71 'um 280/270 v. Chr.' However, Köhler, *Pompai* (1996), 36 is of the opinion the date cannot be more accurately determined than the 280s or 270s BC.

223 See Wilcken, *op. cit.*, 237–240; Taeger, *Charisma* (1957), I, 289–292; Fraser, *The Foundation-Date of the Alexandrian Ptolemaia* (1961), 141–145; Nilsson, *Geschichte* (1988), II, 158–159.

224 Callixin. (FGrHist 627 F 2) ap. Athen. V 32, 202 D. See Hölbl, *Geschichte* (1994), 87.

Ptolemy II was not satisfied with only a few Greek cities recognising him as a god.²²⁵ Probably in 272/271 he proclaimed the state cult of the θεοὶ ἀδελφοί, i.e. his own cult as well as that of Arsinoe II, his sister and wife, which he combined with the cult of Alexander (both cults were administered by the same priest).²²⁶ The θεοὶ ἀδελφοί, however, also had in Alexandria their own sanctuary.²²⁷ After his wife's death, which most probably occurred in July 268,²²⁸ Ptolemy II established a separate cult

225 Habicht, *Gottmenschen* (1970), 112–113 (the Nesiotic League), 116–121 (Byzantium).

226 ἱερεὺς Ἀλεξάνδρου καὶ θεῶν ἀδελφῶν. In *P. Hibeh* 99 there is mention of the θεοὶ ἀδελφοί cult, which is dated to the 15th year of Ptolemy II's reign (271/270), the 20th day of the month of Daisios. However, one may have doubted whether it was established before the death of Arsinoe II (July 270) because the conversion of Macedonian calendar dates to Egyptian ones is debatable. It was not until the publication of *P. Hibeh* 199 (II 12–17), which mentions a priest of Alexander the Great and the θεοὶ ἀδελφοί cult in the 14th year of Ptolemy II's reign (272/271), that the majority of scholars accepted the view that the θεοὶ ἀδελφοί cult was established before the death of Arsinoe. Walbank, *The Hellenistic World* (1981), 213–214, wondered whether the 14th year of Ptolemy II's reign was counted from the year of his father's death in 283/282 or from when he started ruling jointly with his father in 285, i.e. whether this was 270/269 or 272/271. Eventually he decided that it was the latter date. Other scholars who believed that the θεοὶ ἀδελφοί cult was established in 272/271 included: Nock, ΣΥΝΝΑΟΣ ΘΕΟΣ (1930), 5–6, reprint in *idem, Essays* (1972), I, 205–206; Wilcken, *Zur Entstehung* (1938), 243–245; Cerfaux, Tondriau, *Un concurrent de christianisme* (1957), 195–196; Volkmann, *Ptolemaios II* (1959), 1659–1660; Ijsewijn, *De sacerdotibus* (1961), 125–126; Abel, *Zephyritis* (1972), 232; Fraser, *op. cit.*, I 215, II 364–365, n. 208; Préaux, *Le monde hellénistique* (1978), 257; Koenen, *Die Adaption ägyptischer Königsideologie* (1983), 157, n. 41; Fishwick, *The Imperial Cult* (1987), I 1, 14–15; Walbank, *Könige als Götter* (1987), 378; Nilsson, *Geschichte* (1988), II, 159–160; Hölbl, *Geschichte* (1994), 87–88; Huß, *Ägypten* (2001), 325; Hunter, *Theocritus* (2003), 3; Pfeiffer, *The God Serapis* (2008), 398. Of the more recent scholars, Taeger, *Charisma* (1957), I, 293–295 believed the θεοὶ ἀδελφοί cult was founded after Arsinoe's death. As did Wörle, *Epigraphische Forschungen* (1978), 215, n. 67. Also see Müller, *Das hellenistische Königspaar* (2009), 262–266.

227 Herond. 1, 30.

228 For a long time it was thought that Arsinoe died in July 270, but Grzybek, *Du calendrier macédonien au calendrier ptolémaïque* (1990), 103–112 tried to prove that she died on 1st or 2nd July 268 while the θεοὶ ἀδελφοί cult was certainly established before the queen's death. While some scholars have rejected Grzybek's arguments, including Cadell, *À quelle date Arsinoé Philadelphie est-elle décédée?* (1998), 1–3; Criscuolo, *Agoni e politica alla corte di Alessandria* (2003), 328 and Kosmetatou, *Bilistiche* (2004), 34–35, others have accepted them, including: H. Hauben, 'Chronique d'Égypte' 67 fasc. 133, 1992, 160–162 (review of Grzybek's book); Weber, *Dichtung und höfische Gesellschaft* (1993), 172, n. 1; Hazzard, *Imagination of a Monarchy* (2000), 50, 55, 95, 99; Bennet, *Arsinoe and Berenice* (2005), 94 n. 20 (polemic with Kosmetatou). See Müller, *op. cit.*, 287 'nach Grzybeks umstrittener Revision auf den 1/2 Juli 268 v. Chr.'. Less known is the opinion of Koenen, *The Ptolemaic King* (1993), 51–52, n. 61, who believes Arsinoe died on 3rd August 268. Also see Dreyer, *Untersuchungen* (1999), 382–390, esp. 390 'gleichgültig, ob ihr Tod 268 oder 270 anzusetzen ist'.

for her in the temples of Egypt, where she, Arsinoe, was θεὰ φιλάδελ-
φος.²²⁹

c. The Seleucids

Many Greek cities founded a cult for Seleucus I (d. 281) and Antiochus I (d. 261), but it was never as spectacular as in the case of the Antigonids.²³⁰ Nor was there any self-deification as in the case of the Ptolemaic state.²³¹

d. Summary

From the above brief review we can see two types of the ruler cult: a) ones created more or less spontaneously by the poleis for particular rulers and taking on diverse forms in particular cities, b) dynastic cults which were organised from above and whose even local priests were nominated by the ruler.²³² It is interesting that none of Alexander the Great's generals ever dared to perform self-deification. It was only Ptolemy II who first declared him-

229 Wilcken, *Zur Entstehung* (1938), reprint in Wlosok, *Römischer Kaiserkult* (1978), 240–243; Nilsson, *Geschichte* (1988), 159–160; Huß, *Ägypten* (2001), 326, n. 178; Pfeiffer, *The God Serapis* (2008), 399–400; Müller, *Das hellenistische Königspaar* (2009), 280–300.

230 Habicht, *Gottmenschen* (1970), 82–102.

231 Funck, *Die Wurzeln der hellenistischen Euergetes-Religion* (1974), 1290–1334, esp. 1297 ff., is isolated in trying to prove the Seleucus I was declared a god already in his lifetime. Also see *idem*, *Herrscherkult der Seleukiden* (1991), 402–407; van Nuffelen, *Le culte royal* (2004), 278–301 (p. 285 'Nous préférons une date haute, peu avant 209, mais une date plus basse, vers 204, reste elle aussi possible. Ce qui importe, c'est que ce fut Antiochos III qui fonda le culte').

232 This view is held e.g. by Fraser, *Ptolemaic Alexandria* (1972), I, 213–214 and Walbank, *Monarchies and Monarchic Ideas* (1984), 87–99 ('ruler cult' and 'dynastic cult'). Hauben, *Aspects du culte des souverains à l'époque des Lagides* (1989), 452 proposes a somewhat different classification: 'culte privé', 'culte semi-officiel' and 'culte officiel'. Gesche, *Die Vergottung Caesars* (1968), 9–11, distinguishes between 'Vergöttlichung' ('die Zuerkennung und Ausführung von Ehrungen ... wie sie zwar ähnlich für Götter üblich waren, durch die aber der Geehrte nicht sakralrechtlich unter die Staatsgötter erhoben wird, sondern nur eine gewisse Rangerhöhung im menschlich-politischen Bereich erhält', pp. 9–10) and 'Vergottung' ('die offizielle, von staatswegen erfolgende und durch das Sakralrecht des Staates sanktionierte Aufnahme eines Menschen unter die Staatsgötter', p. 10). Also see Herz, *Hellenistische Könige* (1996), 27–40; van Nuffelen, *Le culte des souverains* (1998/1999), 175–189; Kotsidou, *TIMH KAI ΔΟΞΑ* (2000), esp. 559–578; Buraselis, *Political Gods* (2003), 183–197; Chaniotis, *The Divinity* (2003), 431–445; Günther, *Hellenistische Könige als Götter* (2003), 9–26; Virgilio, *Lancia*,

self and his wife to be deities in 272/271. Scholars have wondered whether Euhemerus' work influenced the deification of rulers,²³³ or whether Ptolemy's self-deification influenced Euhemerus.²³⁴ It seems that this question cannot be answered as we do not know exactly when the *Ἱερὰ Ἀναγραφή* was written.²³⁵

G. Hecataeus of Abdera

Thanks to Eduard Schwartz (1858–1940) and F. Jacoby (1876–1959), it is now a widely held view among scholars that Hecataeus' work on Egypt (*Αἰγυπτιακά*)²³⁶ influenced the theological concepts of Euhemerus.²³⁷ Schwartz and Jacoby assumed the Diodorus' *theologoumena* (I 11–29) precisely reflected Hecataeus' views. Since passage I 13, 1 states that Egyptian gods were deified kings, it was concluded that this was Hecataeus' idea, which Euhemerus next applied to Greek gods. Thus Hecataeus became real creator of Euhemerism.²³⁸

Literature on Diodorus' approach to Hecataeus is too extensive to be discussed here. Nevertheless, one should mention the famous hypothesis proposed by Karl Reinhardt (1886–1958) in 1912, according to which cosmogony, zoogony and the origins of culture in book I of Diodorus' *Bibliotheca historica* were derived via Hecataeus from Democritus' *Μικρὸς*

diadema (2003), 87–130; Pfeiffer, *Herrscher-und Dynastiekulte* (2008), 31–76; Muccioli, *Il culto del sovrano* (2011), 97–111.

233 A view held by Fraser, *op. cit.*, I, 294, and Kokolakis, *Zeus' Tomb* (1995), 130. See chapter VI 3 b.

234 Thus Otto, *Priester und Tempel* (1908), II, 274, n. 2; Buffière, *Les mythes d'Homère* (1956), 245; Müller, *Überlegungen zur IEPA ANAGRAΦΗ* (1993), 279, n. 11.

235 See chapter II 3.

236 F. Jacoby proposed *Περὶ Αἰγυπτίων?* in *FGrHist*. However, H. Diels, basing his arguments on Diog. Laert. I 10, opted for the title *Περὶ τῆς Αἰγυπτίων φιλοσοφίας* (DK 73 B 6). Similarly Nestle in Zeller, Nestle, *Die Philosophie* (1920), I 2, 1194, n. 1.

237 Schwartz, *Hekataeos* (1885), 223–224; *idem*, *Diodoros* (1903), 671–672; Jacoby, *Euhemerios* (1907), 969; *idem*, *Hekataios* (1912), 2795; *idem*, *FGrHist III a* (1943), 38.

238 Hecataeus' influence on Euhemerus has been accepted by many scholars, including: Geffcken, *Euhemerism* (1912), 572; Wendland, *Die hellenistisch-römische Kultur* (1912), 120; Salin, *Platon und die griechische Utopie* (1921), 225, 279, n. 4 (Euhemerus wished to surpass his predecessor); Wilamowitz-Moellendorf, *Der Glaube der Hellenen* (1932), II, 270, n. 1; Bidez, Cumont, *Les mages hellénisés* (1938), II, 70, n. 16; Brown, *Euhemerus and the Historians* (1946), 265–266; Murray, *Hecataeus* (1970), 151 with n. 4, 167; Drews, *The Greek Accounts of Eastern History* (1973), 206, n. 162; Rusten, *Dionysius Scytobrachion* (1982), 103, n. 12; Price, *Rituals and Power* (1984), 38; Walbank, *Monarchies* (1984), 77; Nilsson, *Geschichte* (1988), II, 287; Meister, *Diodoros* (1997), 593 (chief source); Dillery, *Hecataeus* (1998), 270.

διάκοσμος (*Little World System*).²³⁹ This view, held by many scholars, was rejected by Walter Spoerri, who tried to prove that Diodorus based his work on opinions well known in the Hellenistic world without any need of referring to Presocratic philosophy. Spoerri's book evoked a lively discussion which has not really been resolved to this day.²⁴⁰ A new look at how Diodorus worked and recognition of his independent approach led to a questioning of the possibility of reconstructing Hecataeus' work on the basis of Diodorus' *theologoumena*. It was realised that, like other ancient scholars,²⁴¹ Diodorus made use of diverse sources to produce his own synthesis.²⁴² That is why, after analysing the sources used in book I of Diodorus' *Bibliotheca historica*, Anne Burton rejected the notion that *theologoumena* could be attributed to Hecataeus. She, nevertheless, concedes that Hecataeus could have been one of Diodorus' sources, since the historian does cite him in his description of Osymandias' grave.²⁴³

All this raises the question as to whether or not we may speak of Hecataeus influencing Euhemerus. We know that Hecataeus was interested in Egyptian religion, because he wrote about the divinity of the sun, the moon, and the stars.²⁴⁴ This would correspond to the first category of gods men-

239 Reinhardt, *Hekataios von Abdera und Demokrit* (1912), 492–513, reprint in *idem*, *Vermächtnis der Antike* (1966), 114–132.

240 Spoerri, *Späthellenistische Berichte* (1959), esp. 189–194; *idem*, *Zu Diodor von Sizilien I*, 7/8 (1961), 63–82. This approach to the problem was disputed by Cole, *Democritus* (1967). Also see Cole's *Postscript* to the second edition of the book in 1990 (pp. 207–213). Some scholars have supported his opinions (e.g. Murray, *Hecataeus* [1970], 169–170; Burstein, *Hecataeus* [1992], 45, n. 1), but others have rightly rejected them, e.g. Burton, *Diodorus* (1972), 44–51; Dodds, *The Ancient Concept of Progress* (1973), 10–11; Sacks, *Diodorus* (1990), 57. It should be noted that some scholars believe Diodorus was influenced by Posidonius, e.g. Pfligersdorffer, *Studien zu Poseidonios* (1959), esp. 100–146; O. Gigon, 'Gnomon' 33, 1961, 771–776; Fraser, *Ptol. Alexandria* (1972), I, 497; Theiler, *Poseidonios* (1982), II, 183–185 (ad fr. 306). R. Philippson, *PhW* 49, 1929, 668–670, on the other hand, assumed that Diodorus relied on Epicurus. See *Forschungsbericht* in Lens Tuero, *Diodoros* (1994), 789–793.

241 On how ancient scholars worked, see Münzer, *Beiträge zur Quellenkritik der Naturgeschichte des Plinius* (1897); Laqueur, *Diodorea* (1958), esp. 268 and 290; Skydsgaard, *Varro the Scholar* (1968), 101–116; Mejer, *Diogenes Laertius* (1978), 16–29; Moraux, *Diogène Laërce* (1986), 254–255, 260–263; Dorandi, *Den Autoren über die Schulter geschaut* (1991), 11–33; Burkert, *Philodems Arbeitstext* (1993), 90.

242 For more on how Diodorus worked, see chapter II 1, n. 2 and 3.

243 Diod. I 46, 8–I 49, 5. Burton, *Diodorus* (1972), 2–9, 70–71. Also see A.B. Lloyd, *JEA* 60, 1974, 287–290; Solmsen, *Isis among the Greeks* (1979), 128, n. 8, 'The contamination seems worst in the theological chapters (19–27)'; Chamoux, *Introduction* (1993), XXIX (the account of Egypt is Diodorus' own synthesis based on various sources); Wirth, *Katastrophe und Zukunftshoffnung* (2007), 101, n. 138.

244 Hecat. (FGrHist 264 F 1) ap. Diog. Laert. I 10–11.

tioned by Diodorus. Moreover, he most probably wrote that the first kings of Egypt were gods, since this information is found in Herodotus,²⁴⁵ and later in Manetho of Sebennytos, the Egyptian priest from Heliopolis who wrote a history of Egypt in Greek at the request of Ptolemy II (285–246).²⁴⁶ However, both Herodotus and Manetho considered the first kings of Egypt to have been real gods. I presume Hecataeus expressed himself in a similar spirit. Diodorus, on the other hand, was convinced euergetism led to the apotheosis of rulers and therefore it was obvious to him that the gods ruling Egypt were deified humans. Perhaps he did not realise he was thus significantly modifying the views contained in his source. Moreover, by trying to systemize religious beliefs, Diodorus used the *theologia dipertita* pattern of thought, which he also applied when discussing Euhemerus' work. Even if Euhemerus had read Hecataeus' book, which is chronologically conceivable,²⁴⁷ he probably would not have found in it the opinion that Egyptian gods were deified rulers. Therefore one cannot consider Hecataeus a source for Euhemerus' religious concepts.²⁴⁸

H. Leon of Pella²⁴⁹

Some ancient authors believed Leon wrote a work proving that Egyptian gods were deified humans.²⁵⁰ Yet others thought that these views were ex-

245 Hdt. II 144 (the last king was Horus, son of Osiris).

246 Manetho (FGrHist 609 T 11 c) ap. Syncel. *Ecl. chronogr.* 29, p. 17 Mosshammer; T 11 b ap. Syncel. *Ecl. Chronogr.* 32 p. 18. On Manetho, see e.g. Laqueur, *Manethon* (1928), 1060–1101; Fraser, *Ptolemaic Alexandria* (1972), I 505–511, II 727–736; Huß, *Der makedonische König* (1994), 123–129; Verbrughe, Wickersham, *Berosos and Manetho* (1996), 95–212; Dillery, *The First Egyptian Narrative History* (1999), 93–116.

247 Murray, *The Date of Hecataeus' Work on Egypt* (1973), 163–167, believes Hecataeus' work on Egypt was probably written in the years 320–315 because Theophrastus cites in his *De lapidibus*, which was written during the archonship of Praxibulus (315/314). Cf. Fraser, *Ptolemaic Alexandria* (1972), II, 719–720, n. 7 'before, or not long after, 315'. Thus they reject the view of Jaeger, *Diokles von Karystos* (1938), 132, that Hecataeus' Αἰγυπτιακά appeared after 305.

248 This conclusion was previously drawn by Spoerri, *Späthellenistische Berichte* (1959), 189–195; Thraede, *Euhemerismus* (1966), 878–879; Burton, *Diodorus* (1972), 70–71; Spoerri, *Hekataios* (1988), 286–287. Müller, *Überlegungen zur IEPΑ ΑΝΑΓΡΑΦΗ* (1993), 283–287, points out (on p. 284) that, unlike Euhemerus and Leon, Hecataeus does not appear in the catalogues of atheists. On this basis Müller concludes that Hecataeus did not write about deified rulers. On the catalogues of atheists, see Winiarczyk, *Der erste Atheistenkatalog des Kleitomachos* (1976), 32–46.

249 The most important work on Leon is: Pfister, *Ein apokrypher Alexanderbrief* (1964), reprint in *idem, Kleine Schriften* (1976), 104–111. Edition: FGrHist 659.

250 Tat. *Or. ad Graec.* 27; Hyg. *Astron.* II 20; Tert. *De cor.* 7; Cl. Al. *Strom.* I 21, 106; Eus. *Praep. ev.* X 12, 23; Arnob. *Adv. nat.* IV 29; Schol. *Apoll. Rhod.* IV 257–262 c p. 274 Wendel.

pressed in a letter written by Alexander the Great to his mother, Olympias.²⁵¹ The issue of authorship can be solved thanks to Augustine, who stated that Alexander wrote the letter on the basis of an account by the Egyptian priest Leon.²⁵²

Some ancient authors cite Leon's letter in reference to impiety because it stated that gods are simply deified people. Leon is even given the epithet ἄθεος in Plutarch's *De Iside et Osiride*.²⁵³ Other ancient authors were interested in a quite different aspect of the letter: who invented particular objects and customs. That is why Friedrich Pfister (1883–1967) came to the conclusion that none of the ancient authors had actually read Alexander's apocryphal letter. They gathered their information about the letter either from works on ἄθεοι or from heurematistic writings (Περὶ εὐρημάτων). Only Augustine used a work by Varro.²⁵⁴

F. Jacoby believed that Leon lived towards the end of the 4th century, had had a direct influence on Hecataeus and an indirect influence on Euhemerus.²⁵⁵ More recently scholars have rejected this hypothesis as there are no valid reasons to date Leon's work so early. Such literature usually appeared in a later period, in the 3rd and 2nd centuries, and therefore it is more probable that Leon was influenced by Euhemerus rather than the other way around.²⁵⁶

Only Arnobius calls Leon *Pellaeus*.²⁵⁷ For a long time it was supposed that this was in reference to an Egyptian priest called Leon. F. Pfister was the first to question this view, arguing that this was not a reference to Leon of Pella but to the 'Lion of Pella', in other words Alexander the Great. Jeffrey S. Rusten rejected F. Pfister's hypothesis,²⁵⁸ and instead argued that the author of the apocryphal letter was indeed someone called Leon of Pella, though this person was certainly not the priest mentioned in the letter. In my opinion, the most likely explanation is, nevertheless, the old one according to which *Pellaeus* meant *Aegyptius*.²⁵⁹ Leon of Pella would there-

251 Tert. *De pallio* 3; Min. Fel. *Oct.* 21, 3; Cypr. *Quod idola* 3; Athenag. *Leg.* 28, 1.

252 Aug. *Civ. Dei* VIII 5; VIII 27; XII 11.

253 Plut. *De Is. et Os.* 23, 360 A (=Euhem. T 15). However, one has to concede that the phrase τῷ ἄθεῳ Λέοντι is a conjecture put into the text by Max Pohlenz (1872–1962) and accepted by other editors. The manuscript version reads: τῷ ἄθεῳ λεῶ or λαῶ.

254 Pfister, *op. cit.*, 293–294.

255 Jacoby, *Euhemerus* (1907), 968–969; *idem*, *Hekataios* (1912), 2759; Geffcken, *Leon von Pella* (1925), 2012; van der Meer, *Euhemerus* (1949), 197; Nilsson, *Geschichte* (1988), II 285.

256 Pfister, *op. cit.*, 291–297; Spoerri, *Leon von Pella* (1969), 565; Fraser, *Ptol. Alexandria* (1972), II, 454, n. 828. Cf. Cole, *Democritus* (1967), 158–159; Rusten, *Pellaeus Leo* (1980) 197, believes this hypothesis to be 'equally possible'.

257 Arnob. *Adv. nat.* IV 29.

258 Rusten, *op. cit.*, 197–201.

259 Tullius, *Die Quellen des Arnobius* (1934), 98, n. 243; Sitte, *Mythologische Quellen des Arnobius* (1970), 13. See e.g. Serv. *Comm. Verg. Georg.* IV 287 'Pellaei Ca-

fore be the Egyptian priest, while the name of the letter's author remains unknown.²⁶⁰

I. Summary

According to Euhemerus, Uranus, Cronus and Zeus were ancient rulers who started being worshipped as gods. The reasons for their deification were the benefactions they had performed for their subjects as well as the fact that they were monarchs. Only Zeus performed self-deification, whereas the other rulers were not declared gods until after their deaths. Euhemerus also mentions the divinity of heavenly bodies. He was therefore not creating a religious theory or being in any such sense original but simply alluding to previously known opinions.

Without doubt Euhemerus was influenced by old Greek ideas such as the deification of heroes (e.g. Heracles, Asclepius and the Dioscuri), the founding of their own cults by Demeter and Dionysus as well as the tradition of Zeus' tomb on Crete. An important factor was the concept of euergetism, already present in the epic poetry of Homer, according to which someone could be called a god if they performed an act of great goodness for the sake of an individual, a group of people or an entire society and thus became a benefactor (εὐεργέτης) or saviour (σωτήρ). Around the year 500 Hecataeus of Miletus was the first to come up with a rationalistic interpretation of myths. It was one that considered the tales of heroes to reflect real historical events, eliminating from them all the miraculous and unbelievable elements. This led to the desacralisation of mythology and allowed for historical events to be seen even in myths regarding the Olympian gods. In the second half of the 5th century Sophists and philosophers became interested in the origins of religion. Several theories emerged to explain how people started to believe in gods (Critias, Prodicus, Democritus). Prodicus may even be considered a precursor of Euhemerus, for he also regarded gods to have been deified benefactors. The cults of commanders and rulers emerged towards the end of the 5th century. The first person to be awarded divine honours in his lifetime was the Spartan commander Lysander (in 404/403). An important role in paving the way to Hellenistic ruler cults was played by the Macedonian monarchs Philip II and Alexander the Great. Yet it was not until 272/271 that Ptolemy II achieved self-deification by proclaiming the θεοὶ ἀδελφοί cult. However, I am not convinced the Euhemerus based his views on Hecataeus of Abdera or Leon of Pella.

nopi'; *Commenta Bern. Lucan.* V 60 'Pellaeo diademate' et VIII 607 'Pellaeusque puer'. Cf. Tert. *De cor.* 7 'Leonis Aegyptii'.

260 Thus e.g. Pfister, *op. cit.*, 296–297; Cole, *op. cit.*, 20, n. 13; Speyer, *Die literarische Fälschung* (1971), 146; Fraser, *op. cit.*, II, 454, n. 828.

In my opinion one cannot speak of Euhemerus' sources *sensu stricto*, that is he did not base his book on any specific work. It is very probable that at the turn of the 3th century BC every educated Greek possessed a general knowledge of literature, philosophy and religion. No doubt Euhemerus was also aware of the power struggles that followed Alexander the Great's death. Thus it was possible for the author to cleverly combine various elements in a book that had a considerable influence on later generations.

IV. Society and economy in the Ἱερὰ Ἀναγραφή

Euhemerus writes that on the instructions of the Macedonian king Cassander (305–298/297) he set out on voyage from Arabia Felix. In the Indian Ocean he accidentally discovered an archipelago comprising the islands of Hieria and Panchaea as well as a smaller, unnamed island where the dead were buried.¹

1. The island of Hieria²

Ownership of the land on the island of Hieria is divided among the inhabitants, but the largest share belongs to the king, who moreover receives a tenth of all harvested crops (V 42, 1). The source of island's wealth are trees bearing frankincense and myrrh.³ The inhabitants sell the frankincense and myrrh on the continent to Arab merchants, who then transport the incense to Phoenicia, Coele-Syria and Egypt (V 42, 2). The existence of private property and individual trade has led to social stratification. Other species of

- 1 Diod. VI 1, 4–5 = T 3; V 41, 4 = T 30. Cf. Str. X 5, 5 p. 486 Ἱήρνα δ' ἔρημον νησιδίων ἔστιν ἐν τέτρασι τῆς Δήλου σταδίοις, ὅπου τὰ μνήματα τοῖς Δηλίοις ἔστιν, οὐ γὰρ ἔξεστιν ἐν αὐτῇ τῇ Δήλῳ θάπτειν οὐδὲ καίειν νεκρόν. Cf. Thucyd. III 104; Diod. XII 58, 7. See Jacoby, *Euemerios* (1907), 959; Rohde, *Der griechische Roman* (1914), 237, n. 2; Zumschlinge, *Euhemerios* (1976), 17–19.
- 2 Description of the island in Diod. V 41, 4 – V 42, 2 (T 30). In chapter IV 3 I try to prove that Hieria and Panchaea are not the same island.
- 3 It was generally believed that frankincense and myrrh came from Arabia Felix. E.g. Hdt. III 107; Theophr. *Hist. pl.* IV 4, 14; IX 4, 1–2.10; Eratosth. (III B 48 Berger) ap. Str. XVI 4, 4 p. 768; Diod. III 46, 3; Str. XVI 4, 14.19.25; Arrian. *Anab.* VII 20, 2. See Steier, *Myrrha* (1933), 1134–1146; Rathjens, *Kulturelle Einflüsse* (1950/51), 1–42; van Beek, *Frankincense and Myrrh* (1958), 141–151; Müller, *Weihrauch* (1978), 709–715; Groom, *Frankincense and Myrrh* (1981); Martinetz, Lohs, Janzen, *Weihrauch und Myrrhe* (1989); Herzhoff, *Index der Pflanzen* (1993), 88 (λιβανωτός), 92–93 (σμύρνα); Robin, *Arabie méridionale* (1997), 37–56; Breton, *Arabia Felix* (1999), 53–73, 187–189; Singer, *The Incense Kingdoms* (2007), 4–27. On the incense trade route, see Tarn, *Ptolemaios II and Arabia* (1929), 11; Höge-mann, *Alexander* (1985), 97–102; Isaac, *Trade-Routes* (1989), 241–256; De Mair-gret, *The Frankincense Road* (1997), 315–331; Macdonald, *Trade Routes* (1997), 333–349; McLaughlin, *Rome and the Distant East* (2010), 61–81, 194–200; Seland, *Ports and Political Power* (2010), 17–31. Cf. Plin. *Nat. hist.* XII 63–65. According to Miller, *The Spice Trade* (1969), 103, there are nine species of *Boswellia* incense tree: five grow in Arabia, two in tropical Africa, one in tropical West Africa and one in India. Also see Martinetz, Lohs, Janzen, *Weihrauch* (1989), 73–87.

incense (θυμιάματα) also grow on the island as well as a thorny shrub (παλίουρος)⁴ whose fruit serve as food, a beverage and a medicine against diarrhoea (V 41, 6). The island is called Hierā because it bears frankincense and myrrh used in the cult of gods and because the dead cannot be buried there.⁵

2. The island of Panchaea

The natives of Panchaea are Panchaeans, while the island's immigrant population include Oceanites, Indians, Scythians and Cretans.⁶ The island had previously been inhabited by the Doians, until they were expelled by Ammon,⁷ who destroyed their cities of Doia and Asterusia.⁸ Zeus and Mount

- 4 On παλίουρος, see Theophr. *Hist. pl.* III 18, 3; Plin. *Nat. hist.* XXIV 71; Diosc. *De mat. med.* I 92.
- 5 According to Vallauri, *Evezero* (1956), 51. See Plin. *Nat. hist.* XII 54; Solin. 33, 5 'regio turifera ... Arabia appellata id est sacra'; cf. Isid. *Etym.* XIV 3, 15. The reservations of Zumschlinge, *Euhemerus* (1976), 19–21, do not seem justified. However, I do not think it right to assume that the island was considered sacred on account of its devotion to the Sun (as suggested by van Gils, *Quaestiones* [1902], 22 with n. 3 and van der Meer, *Euhemerus* [1949], 36 ff.). This view was rightly criticised by Braunert, *Die heilige Insel* (1965), 261, n. 17.
- 6 Diod. V 42, 4 = T 33. Various etymologies of the word 'Panchaea' have been proposed: a) the most likely is πᾶν + χάιος; Hesych. s.v. χάιος: ἀγαθός; *Schol. Theocr.* 7, 5 p. 78 Wendel χαῖα γὰρ παρὰ Λακεδαιμονίους τὰ ἀγαθὰ, χαῖον δὲ τὸ εὐγενὲς καὶ ἀρχαῖον, ὁμοίως καὶ τὸ χάιον; *Schol. Aesch. Suppl.* 859 (I 81 Smith) βαθυχαῖος; ἡ μεγάλως εὐγενής; χαοὶ γὰρ οἱ εὐγενεῖς, cf. Suda s.v. χαῖα (IV 779 Adler) et *Schol. Aristoph. Lys.* 90. See Frisk, *Etym. Wörterbuch* (1970), II, 1062 and Pape, *Wörterbuch* (1863–1870), II, 1103; Παγχαῖοι = οἱ πᾶν εὐγενεῖς or alternatively οἱ πᾶν ἀρχαῖοι Jacoby, *Euhemerus* (1907), 960, b) πᾶς + γῆ, γαῖα: van der Meer, *Euhemerus* (1949) 38, c) Panchaia < pa-anch (egypt. 'life'): Hommel, *Die Insel* (1901), 21–22, d) Panchaia < Pāndja (Indian people, cf. Πανδαῖοι, Πανδίονες): Rohde, *Der gr. Roman* [1914], 240, n. 0); this view was rightly rejected by Jacoby, *op. cit.* 960 and Ziegler, *Panchāia* (1949), 494, e) 'ΠΑΓΧΑΙΑ – ΠΑΓΧΑ pour ΛΑΓΧΑ?': Blochet, *De l'autonomie* (1934), 165, n. 41
- 7 van Gils, *Quaestiones* (1902), 39, and Zumschlinge, *Euhemerus* (1976), 45–46 believed that Ἄμμων = Ζεὺς Ἄμμων, but a different view was held by Vallauri, *Evezero* (1956), 52. On Ζεὺς Ἄμμων: Cook, *Zeus* (1914), I, 348–371; Leclant, Clerc, *Ammon* (1981), 666–689; Kreutz, *Zeus* (2007), 202–204; Tsigarida, *The Sanctuary of Zeus Ammon* (2011), 170–177. See Plut. *Lys.* 25; Paus. III 18, 3; IX 16, 1; Steph. Byz. s.v. Ἀφύτη ἢ Ἄφουτις.
- 8 Diod. V 44, 7 = T 34. On Doia, see van Gils, *op. cit.*, 24 'hostes fuisse videntur ceteris incolis. Ammon igitur, Doiis eiectis, gratum reliquis fecisse videtur. Doiorum locus occupatur ab Indis, Scythis et Cretensibus'. Cf. Baunack, *Hesychstudien* (1912), 72, n. 1, δῶια = ζῶια, ζῶα. This view was accepted by Zumschlinge, *Euhemerus* (1976), 55–56. A different view is held by Ferguson, *Utopias* (1975), 105 'The Indian Doanes may be at the back of Doia'. See Steph. Byz. s.v. Ἀστερουσία: ὅρος Κρήτης πρὸς τὸ νότιον μέρος.

Olympus carry the epithet Τριφύλιος because the island was once inhabited by three nations: the Panchaeans, Oceanites and Doians.⁹ Interpretation of this testimony poses certain difficulties. P.J.M. van Gils¹⁰ assumed that the Indians, Scythians and Cretans arrived on the island only after the Doians had been expelled, whereas Marianne Zumschlinge¹¹ believes that these three peoples were collectively called Oceanites, i.e. people who had arrived from across the Ocean, though this seems to me a less likely explanation. The chief city of the island is Panara, while other important cities include Hyracia, Dalis and Oceanis.¹²

Panchaeian society is divided into three groups:¹³ 1) priests (ιερείς) and craftsmen (τεχνῖται), 2) farmers (γεωργοί), 3) soldiers (στρατιῶται) and shepherds (νομεῖς). It is surprising that priests and craftsmen are included in the same group. Here Diodorus has even been suspected of making a mistake,¹⁴ but this is not the right approach because one should first try to understand Euhemerus' way of thinking. Worth noting is Roland J. Müller's interpretation,¹⁵ according to which, since Panchaeians were exceptionally

9 Diod. V 44, 6 = T 34.

10 Thus according to van Gils, *Quaestiones* (1902), 24, and Braunert, *Staatstheorie* (1968), 54.

11 Zumschlinge, *Euhemerios* (1976), 50–54.

12 Diod. V 45, 2 = T 35. There are no grounds to support the view of Braunert, *Die heilige Insel* (1965), 264, that Panara is a nickname of one of the other three cities. Etymological interpretations of the word Panara: a) πᾶν + ἄρα: van der Meer, *Euhemerios* (1949), 48 and 137, b) Πανάρα = Φανάρα ('Lichtenberg'): Pape, Benseler, *Wörterbuch* (1884), II, 1120, c) Clay, Purvis, *Four Island Utopias* (1999), 102, n. 14 'Evidently a compound formed from *Pan* ('all') and either *ara* ('prayer') or the *ar* of *aristos* ('best')'.

13 Diod. V 45, 3 = T 35. This division could have been introduced by Zeus himself the same way as Athena did in prehistoric Athens (Pl. *Tim.* 24 A-C). This view is held by Zumschlinge, *Euhemerios* (1976), 86, and Müller, *Überlegungen* (1993), 295. See chapter IV 4, where I provide examples of societies being divided into three levels. On the significance of the number '3' in Euhemerus' work, see Salin, *Platon* (1921), 231–232; van der Meer, *Euhemerios* (1949), 42: 3 islands Diod. V 41, 4 (T 30), Ζεὺς Τριφύλιος V 42, 5 (T 33), 3 ἄρχοντες V 42, 5 (T 33), 3 peoples V 44, 6 (T 34), 3 cities V 45, 2 (T 35), 3 social layers V 45, 3 (T 35). That is why I disagree with the view of Honigman, *Euhemerios* (2009), 27, that the division into three social groups should be seen 'in this rhetorical *coquetterie*, and not in any philosophical or social programme'. On the significance of the number '3' in the ancient world see e.g. Usener, *Dreiheit* (1903); Lease, *The Number Three* (1919), 56–73; Mehrlein, *Dreiheit* (1959), 269–310; Lüthi, *Drei, Dreizahl* (1981), 851–868; Endres, Schimmel, *Das Mysterium der Zahl* (1984), 72–100, 310–312 (bibliography).

14 Zumschlinge, *op. cit.*, 80.

15 Müller, *Überlegungen* (1993), 293. Less convincing is the interpretation proposed by Pöhlmann, *Geschichte* (1925), II, 296, according to which priests and the *technitai* belonged to the same group because they formed 'eine Kulturaristokratie, eine Hierarchie der Kapazitäten'.

pious, the craftsmen produced artefacts primarily intended for the gods.¹⁶ No doubt they made statues of gods as well as votive items of silver and gold used to decorate the great temenos. In other words they served the gods similarly to priests and that is why together they formed one social group. However, one has to remember that craftsmen also produced many things for the people, including expensive robes and jewellery. Therefore they did not serve gods exclusively. The common feature of soldiers and shepherds is keeping guard. Ones guard the country against brigands who occupy a certain part of the island, while the others guard animal herds. If there is a need, shepherds also assist the soldiers in defending the country. The soldiers live in strongholds and are paid in kind, because the island does not have a money based economy. Their method of fighting is archaic as they use chariots.¹⁷

Julius Kaerst (1857–1930)¹⁸ assumed that in Panchaeon society, divided into three groups, there existed the principle of inheriting professions as a means of maintaining professional standards. Indeed, inheritance was observed by the Chaldeans, experts in the knowledge of astrology, as well as Egyptian craftsmen.¹⁹ Some scholars, however, doubt that Euhemerus actually wrote about closed professions.²⁰ It seems that this issue cannot be resolved on the basis of Diodorus' text.

The inhabitants do not have private property, with the exception of farmers and shepherds, who own their own houses and gardens. The crops they grow and the animals they rear are shared among the people (εἰς τὸ κοινόν, εἰς τὸ δημόσιον), and priests are responsible for making sure everyone is given a fair share as a means to live.²¹ It seems that everyone receives an

16 Diod. VI 1, 4 = T 3. Nations considered in ancient times to be particularly religious are listed by Winiarczyk, *Die hellenist. Utopien* (2011), 244–245.

17 Diod. V 45, 1 et 3 = T 35. On the use of chariots by various peoples, see Nesselrath, *Platon, Kritias* (2006), 387.

18 Kaerst, *Geschichte* (1926), II, 154.

19 Diod. II 29, 4 (Chaldaean); Diod. I 74, 6 (Egypt). See Burton, *Diodorus* (1972), 217–218.

20 Fraser, *Ptol. Alexandria* (1972), II, 448, n. 804; Aalders, *Political Thought* (1975), 67, n. 82. One should add that division into professional groups in Egypt was not as rigid as the Greeks believed. See Braunert, *Staatstheorie* (1968), 55 and Burton, *Diodorus* (1972), 213; Allam, *Bevölkerungsklassen* (1975), 774.

21 Diod. V 45, 5 = T 35. That is why some scholars believed the system in Panchaea to be socialistic or even communistic. E.g. Susemihl, *Geschichte* (1891), I, 318 'leise communistisch angehauchte Verfassung'; Pöhlmann, *Geschichte* (1925), II, 297 'kommunistisch-sozialistische Wirtschaftsordnung'; Helm, *Der antike Roman* (1956), 25 'ein gemildeter Kommunismus'; Strasburger, *Zum antiken Gesellschafts-ideal* (1976), 99 'der kommunistische Idealstaat'. Iambulus' narrative was also willingly described as communistic. See Winiarczyk, *Die hellenist. Utopien* (2011), 192. More recently Bosworth, *Alexander and the East* (1996), 87, referred to Musicanus' state in India, described by Onesicritus of Astypalaia, as 'a model of an

identical allotment of arable land or pasture, but Diodorus' text does not state who first divided up the land and to whom it really belongs.²² The corn is probably stored in granaries.²³ Priests are given twice as much grain as everyone else, while the best ten farmers and the ten best shepherds receive special rewards. The number of privileges is limited so as to avoid tensions between rich and poor inhabitants.²⁴ Euhemerus prudently refrained from providing any details of how property is fairly divided.

Although the island has mines of gold, silver, tin and iron, these metals cannot be exported from the island.²⁵ The Panchaeian economy appears to be strikingly simple or even primitive.²⁶ It is based on arable farming and animal husbandry. Trade and the use of money are non-existent and no one travels abroad. Panchaea has a typically closed society which is self-suffici-

ideal communistic society'. I, however, consider such modern analogies to be highly inappropriate. It is pointless to compare socio-economic relations on the island of Panchaea with life in the Soviet Union. This view is shared e.g. by Ferguson, *Utopias* (1975), 107–108. Although already Salin, *Der "Sozialismus"* (1923), 15–59, criticised using the concept of 'socialism' in reference to ancient societies, his point of view was quite ignored by later scholars. Scholars who did see the problem included: Rostovtzeff, *The Social and Economic History* (1953), III, 1367, n. 34 'It is inappropriate to talk of the existence of socialism in Greece. Socialism as a theory is a creation of modern times'; Tigerstedt, *The Legend of Sparta*, (1974), II, 73–74. Also see Beloch, *Socialismus* (1901), 359–364; Oertel, *Die soziale Frage* (1927), 1–18. Unfortunately Cizek, *L'esprit* (2006), 49–61, has returned to the erroneous concept of communism and communist states in antiquity.

- 22 Aalders, *Political Thought* (1975), 67, n. 84, rightly rejected the assumption of Fraser, *Ptol. Alexandria* (1972), I, 290, that Panchaea had 'a system of common ownership of all land'. But there are also no grounds for the assumption of Bertelli, *Il modello* (1976), 203, that all the land belonged to the king ('un possessore reale'). See n. 78 (the division of land in Plato's *Laws*).

- 23 According to Pöhlmann, *Geschichte* (1925), II, 298.

- 24 Diod. V 45, 4–5 = T 35. As noted by Müller, *Überlegungen* (1993), 296, already Plato came to the conclusion that large social stratification could lead to deep divisions and even civil war (*Leg.* V 744 D–745 B). In *Leg.* V 740 A–742 C, he writes how to avoid the excessive enrichment of individuals.

- 25 Diod. V 46, 4 = T 35. Gold and silver mines were also found in Musicanus' state (Onesicr. FGrHist 134 F 24 ap. Str. XV 1, 34 p. 702) as well as the land of Sopeithes (Onesicr. 134 F 21 ap. Str. XV 1, 30 p. 700). Also see Megasth. (FGrHist 715 F 13 a ap. Arrian. *Ind.* 8, 13 (gold mines); F 27 b ap. Str. XV 1, 57 p. 711 (gold sand in rivers). Gold in India was previously mentioned by Hdt. III 98, 1; III 105, 2 and Ctes. (FGrHist 688 F 45 § 26) ap. Phot. 72 p. 46b. Mines of various metals were also found on Atlantis, but Plato (*Crit.* 114 E) does not write about silver and gold. See Nesselrath, *Plato, Kritias* (2006), 286–291. On gold in India, see Winiarczyk, *Die hellenist. Utopien* (2011), 100 with n. 193 and 194.

- 26 See Bichler, *Zur histor. Beurteilung* (1984), 193. The low significance of trade in the utopias of Plato and Aristotle was discussed by Hasebroek, *Staat und Handel* (1928), 188–195. On the lifestyles of people living close to nature, see Dihle, *Zur hellenist. Ethnographie* (1962), 217–222, reprint in: Dihle, *Antike und Orient* (1983), 31–36. Also see Vischer, *Das einfache Leben* (1965).

ent and maintains no contacts with the outside world. The inhabitants' diet is very simple, for they only eat cereal products, meat and fruit (grapes, dates and nuts) and perhaps drink wine.

The priests perform the most important role in society because they are responsible for the administration of justice as well as the distribution of crops and reared animals.²⁷ They came to power only after the dynasty founded by Zeus had died out.²⁸ They are more affluent than other inhabitants as is apparent in their wearing of mitres on their heads and exceptionally soft robes of linen and wool. Like the island's women, they also wear coloured sandals, and golden ornaments, but no earrings.²⁹ They worship the gods by singing hymns and encomia, praising their deeds and benefactions granted to people.³⁰ They live around the temple and are not allowed to leave the temenos, which is 200 stades long (i.e. some 40 km),³¹ because then anyone could kill them.³² The priests were brought over from Crete by Zeus himself. Their origin is testified in the way they speak, for they use words from the Cretan dialect.³³

- 27 Οἱ μὲν οὖν ἱερεῖς τῶν ἀπάντων ἦσαν ἡγεμόνες, τάς τε τῶν ἀμφισβητήσεων κρίσεις ποιοῦμενοι καὶ τῶν ἄλλων τῶν δημοσίων πραττομένων κύριοι (Diod. V 45, 4 = T 35); πάντα δὲ τὰ γεννήματα καὶ τὰς προσόδους οἱ ἱερεῖς παραλαμβάνοντες τὸ ἐπιβάλλον ἐκάστῳ δικαίως ἀπονέμουσι (Diod. V 45, 5 = T 35; cf. V 42, 5 = T 33). More recent scholars have suggested the following descriptions of Panchaeian priests: Braunert, *Staatstheorie* (1968), 59 'politisch und ökonomisch geschulte Elite'; Burde, *Untersuchungen* (1974), 51 the rule of priests was to ensure 'die Herrschaft der Intelligenz'; Kytzler, *Utopisches Denken* (1973), 62 'Inteligentsia oder vielleicht besser ... die Technokraten der damaligen Gesellschaft'. Pöhlmann's view has been cited in n. 15 above.
- 28 Müller, *Überlegungen* (1993), 291 – 292, n. 69, is of the opinion that Zeus did not found a dynasty on Panchaea as he was the ruler of the entire world (V 46, 3 = T 35) and was only a willing guest on the island (Lact. *Div. inst.* I 11, 35 = T 67). This, however, ignores the fact that Zeus 'postquam quinque terras circuevit omnibusque amicis atque cognatis suis imperia divisit' (Lact. *Div. inst.* I 11, 45 = T 69 A). One may therefore assume that Zeus gave his favourite island of Panchaea to his descendants Artemis and Apollo, whose deeds were later recorded by Hermes on the golden stele (V 46, 7 = T 37). That is why Müller's argument appears to be wrong.
- 29 On the attire of priests, see Wächter, *Reinheitsvorschriften* (1910), 18–20; Stengel, *Die griech. Kultusaltertümer* (1920), 47; Zumschlinge, *Euhemerus* (1976), 39 – 43. van Gils, *Quaestiones* (1902), 25, n. 1, assumed that Euhemerus was relying on Xen. *Anab.* I 5, 8, while van der Meer, *Euhemerus* (1949), 41, n. 4, thought his source was Herodotus (III 20, IX 80). It should be added that other inhabitants, both men and women, wore delicate robes and ornaments of gold such as necklaces, bracelets and earrings. (V 45, 6 = T 35).
- 30 Diod. V 46, 2 = T 35 τὰς εἰς ἀνθρώπους εὐεργεσίας.
- 31 Diod. V 44, 5 = T 38.
- 32 Diod. V 46, 4 = T 35. Similar limitations were imposed on the kings of the Mosynoeci (Xenoph. *Anab.* V 4, 26) and Sabaeans (Agatharch. *De mari Erythr.* 100 [GGM I 189] ap. Diod. III 47, 4). See Hoefler, *Pontosvoelker* (1904), 551–553.
- 33 Diod. V 46, 3 = T 35.

A special status is held by the citizens of Panara, who are called the suppliants of Zeus Triphylus. They have retained their autonomy (αὐτόνομοι καὶ ἀβασίλευτοι), since each year they elect three archons with the authority to decide on all matters. The only exception is the passing of death sentences, which is why perpetrators of the most serious crimes are handed over to be judged by the priests.³⁴

Euhemerus' description of Panchaeian society is realistic because he does not include any extraordinary, miraculous or fabulous elements.³⁵ The inhabitants of Panchaea are no different from anyone else in the Greek world. Their lifespans are not extraordinarily long as in the case of the inhabitants of Iambulus' Island of the Sun, India or Ethiopia,³⁶ nor do they have any special attributes, such as forked tongues enabling simultaneous conversation with two different people as in Iambulus' novel. Panchaeians sometimes suffer from diseases as mundane as diarrhoea (V 41, 6 = T 30). They do not form an ideal community since the inhabitants do commit crimes, sometimes even one's necessitating the death penalty. Moreover, the state is threatened by the attacks of robbers who occupy a part of the island. Family life does exist, but probably only among farmers and shepherds, and there is no mention of a community of women and children as exists in Iambulus' tale (Diod. II 58, 1). Equality is not absolute because hard working farmers and shepherds receive rewards for very good crop yields or exceptionally successful livestock rearing.

Nevertheless, one has to concede that not all the problems concerning Panchaeian society and the island's economy are clear to us. For example, we do not know for certain whether or not there was slavery because Diodorus does not mention slaves.³⁷ The Greeks, and later the Romans did in fact believe that there had been no slavery in the good old days, but by this they meant a golden age when the earth itself produced yields or there existed wonderful devices that performed the work of humans.³⁸ It was only in such

34 Diod. V 42, 5 = T 33 θανάτου μὲν οὐκ εἰσι κύριοι.

35 This was noted, among others, by Susemihl, *Geschichte* (1891), I, 317–318; Jacoby, *Euemerios* (1907), 961–962; Geffcken, *Euhemerism* (1912), 573; Pöhlmann, *Geschichte* (1925), II, 302.

36 Inhabitants of the Island of the Sun live for as long as 150 years (Diod. II 57, 4). Testimonies of the longevity of various peoples are listed by Winiarczyk, *Die hellenist. Utopien* (2011), 238–241, 265.

37 Slavery exists: Brown, *Onesicritus* (1949), 71; No slavery: Ferguson, *Utopias* (1975), 105; Garlan, *Les sociétés sans esclaves* (1981), 136. A compromise is suggested by Vogt, *Die Sklaverei im utopischen Denken* (1972), 138 – 139 'Die Fragmente dieser utopischen Staaten [incl. Euhemerus] lassen nicht erkennen, ob auch die Frage der Sklaverei in ihrer Dringlichkeit erkannt war.'

38 Luria, *Die Ersten werden die Letzten* (1929), 405–431, esp. 420 ff; Langerbeck, *Die Vorstellung vom Schlaraffenland* (1963), 192–204; Gatz, *Weltalter* (1967), 114–128, 229 (index s.v. absentia servorum); Vogt, *Sklaverei* (1972), 132–133; Fauth, *Kuli-*

conditions that slaves were considered unnecessary, yet the Ἰερὰ Ἀναγραφή certainly does not present an ideal society,³⁹ and its description provides only the background to a presentation of the origins of religion. That is why I believe Euhemerus either wrote about slaves (e.g. working in the mines), and this failed to arouse Diodorus' interest, or ignored the problem as Plato did in the Πολιτεία.⁴⁰

The island's natural landscape is rich and very diverse. There are many types of trees (cypresses, plane trees, laurels, date palms and hazel trees) as well as grapevines and meadows covered with flowers.⁴¹ It is also inhabited by beautifully coloured, singing birds⁴² as well as elephants, lions, panthers and antelope.⁴³ Moreover, there are sources and rivers.⁴⁴ The author presents the island as a *locus amoenus*, a literary convention well known to the Greeks.⁴⁵ It already appeared in the poetry of Homer and continued to be applied in literature during the Roman Empire. However, Euhemerus does not use the wonders of Indian nature as described by Nearchus and Onesicritus,⁴⁶ so as not to arouse the suspicions of readers.

narisches (1973), 39–62; Rehrenböck, *Das Schlaraffenland* (1987), 14–25; Versnel, *Inconsistencies* (1994), 122–126; Bichler, *Von der Insel* (1995), 85–96, 205–207. Testimonies regarding the absence of slavery are listed by Winiarczyk, *Die hellenist. Utopien* (2011), 255.

39 See chapter VI 4.

40 I am inclined to agree with those scholars who argue that Plato did not remove slaves from his ideal state in the *Politeia*. This innovation would have required justification. See e.g. Morrow, *Plato's Law of Slavery* (1939), esp. 129–133, Vlastos, *Does Slavery Exist in Platos Republic?* (1968), 291–295, reprint in *idem, Platonic Studies* (1973), 140–146; Annas, *An Introduction to Plato's Republic* (1981), 171; Dawson, *Cities* (1992), 105, n. 23. However, Calvert, *Slavery* (1987), 367–372 and Reeve, *Philosopher-Kings* (1988), 216–217 believe there would be no slaves in Kallipolis.

41 Diod. V 43, 1–3 = T 38.

42 Diod. V 43, 2 = T 38. On birds in Hellenistic utopias, see Jacobson, *The Exagoge* (1983), 161 and 220, n. 44.

43 Diod. V 45, 1 = T 39. Elephants also inhabit Atlantis (Pl. *Crit.* 114 E). See Nesselrath, *Platon, Kritias* (2006), 292–293. On animals inhabiting Iambulus' Island of the Sun, see Diod. II 58, 2–5.

44 Diod. V 43, 2 and V 44, 3 = T 38.

45 See chapter II 4 B.

46 Indian flora: Nearch. (FGrHist 133 F 6) ap. Arrian. *Ind.* 11, 7; Onesicr. (FGrHist 134) F 15 ap. Str. XV 1, 18 p. 692 and F 22 ap. Str. XV 1, 21. 22. See Karttunen, *India* (1997), 129–166; Arora, *The Fragments of Onesikritos* (2005), 55–63. Indian fauna: Nearch. F 7, 8 a, 9, 10 a ap. Arrian. *Ind.* 15, 1.4.8.10; F 8 b ap. Str. XV 1, 44 p. 705; F 10 b ap. Str. XV 1, 45 p. 706; F 22 ap. Str. XV 1, 43 p. 705; Onesicr. F 7 ap. Arrian. *Ind.* 6, 8; F 13 ap. Plin. *Nat. hist.* VI 81; F 16 a ap. Str. XV 1, 28 p. 698; F 16 b ap. Ael. *Nat. anim.* XVI 39. Cf. Clitarchus (FGrHist 137) F 18–19 ap. Ael. *Nat. anim.* XVII 2. 25; F 20 ap. Str. XV 1, 69 p. 718; F 21 ap. Ael. *Nat. anim.* XVII 23; F 22 ap. Ael. *Nat. anim.* XVII 22. See Karttunen, *India* (1997), 167–187; Arora, *The Fragments* (2005), 49–55.

Euhemerus attempted to create the illusion that he was describing a real island in the Indian Ocean. He maintained that from an eastern cape of the island one could see the mountains of India, i.e. the Himalayas.⁴⁷ Despite this, most ancient geographers and historians regarded the discovery of Panchaea as literary fiction.⁴⁸ Only Diodorus totally believed Euhemerus had sailed in the Indian Ocean and discovered there a group of islands. Even more naïve were the modern scholars who tried to identify the real island of Panchaea.⁴⁹ Attempts to identify the island of Panchaea are, however, quite futile since it was always literary fiction.

3. Why Hieria should not be identified as Panchaea

In the past some scholars were of the opinion that Panchaea and Hieria were one and the same island,⁵⁰ though it was Horst Braunert (1922–1976) who first popularized this hypothesis by attempting to provide it with an extensive justification.⁵¹ He pointed to the fact that Diodorus called Panchaea the ‘sacred island of the gods’⁵² and on this basis he concluded that Hieria was another name for Panchaea whereas the island where frankincense and myrrh grew was unnamed like the island where the dead were buried. Moreover, he argued that since the citizens of Panara were ἀβασίλευτοι, the remaining inhabitants were subjects of the king. That is why H. Braunert accused Diodorus of making an error in his précis of Euhemerus’ work by stating that the king lived on Hieria and not on Panchaea.

Although some scholars have accepted Braunert’s point of view,⁵³ I believe a detailed analysis of his arguments will incline us to reject this hypothesis.⁵⁴ Firstly, Braunert did not take into account that the adjective ἀβασί-

47 Diod. V 42, 3 = T 31. See Tarn, *Alexander* (1933), 45–46; van der Meer, *Euhemerus* (1949), 39.

48 Eratosth. (I B 6 Berger) ap. Str. I 3, 1 p. 47 (T 4); I B 7 Berger ap. Str. II 4, 2 p. 104 = Polyb. *Hist.* XXXIV 5 (T 5); Apollodor. (FGrHist 244 F 157 a) ap. Str. VII 3, 6 p. 299 (T 6); Str. II 3, 5 p. 102 (T 7 A, cf. T 7 B); Plut. *De Is. et Os.* 23 p. 359 E–360 B (T 15).

49 Also see chapter I 4 A (Euhemerus in geographic tradition) and chapter II 4 A, n. 34 (attempts to locate the island).

50 Hommel, *Die Insel* (1901), 13; Tkač, *Saba* (1920), 1403; Hüsing, *Panchaia* (1929), 101.

51 Braunert, *Die heilige Insel* (1965), 255–268.

52 Diod. VI 1, 5 = T 3 νῆσον ἱερὰν θεῶν.

53 Burde, *Untersuchungen* (1974), 50; Aalders, *Political Thought* (1975), 66–67; Ferguson, *Utopias* (1975), 104; Bertelli, *Il modello* (1976), 202, n. 77; Zumschlinge, *Euhemerios* (1976), 21–22; Sartori, *Storia, 'utopia'* (1984), 518.

54 Müller, *Zur sozialen Utopie* (1980), 198, n. 6; Kuch, *Funktionswandlungen* (1989), 55–57; Müller, *Überlegungen* (1993), 291, n. 69; Hennig, *Utopia politica* (1998), 516, n. 47.

λευτος also means ‘not subject to any authority’.⁵⁵ It seems to me that the term αὐτόνομοι καὶ ἀβασίλευτοι is a typical *hendiadys* which stresses the independence of Panara but says nothing about the rest of Panchaea being ruled by a king.⁵⁶ Secondly, the presented socio-economic relations on Hieria and Panchaea are quite different: a) it is hard to square the supreme authority of the king on Hieria (V 42, 1) with the absolute authority of the priests on Panchaea (V 45, 4); b) on Hieria the king receives a tithe (V 42, 1), whereas on Panchaea there is common ownership and only the priests have the right to distribute the grain and livestock among the inhabitants (V 45, 4–5); c) private property exists on Hieria whereas on Panchaea the land is common property and only peasants and shepherds have their own houses and gardens (V 45, 5); d) the only natural resources on Hieria are frankincense and myrrh (V 41, 4), while the inhabitants of Panchaea were engaged in arable farming and cattle rearing (V 45, 4–5); e) the inhabitants of Hieria sell frankincense and myrrh to Arab merchants on the mainland (V 42, 2), whereas the inhabitants of Panchaea never leave their island and do not use money; f) Diodorus writes about three islands but states that only one is nameless (V 41, 4); g) the total width of Hieria is 200 stades (V 42, 1), whereas on Panchaea only the temenos is 200 stades long (V 44, 5). The contradictions in the descriptions of Hieria and Panchaea are so evident that it is surprising a number of scholars have accepted such a daring hypothesis. Admittedly some of them did appreciate the difficulties of this interpretation, but they nevertheless tried to support Braunert’s notion with other hypotheses that were not based on Diodorus’ text. Reinhold Bichler assumes that the account of royal land and the tithe paid to the king concerns a part of Panchaea that was not controlled by the priests.⁵⁷ Lucio Bertelli, on the other hand, is of

55 See C.B. Hase in ThGL I, 1831, 47 A, ‘sensu paulo magis generali, Non mode rege carens sed omnino regente vel regentibus’ (here he gives numerous examples). Cf. LSJ I 2 ‘free from rule’.

56 The term αὐτόνομοι καὶ ἀβασίλευτοι appears in ThLG (programme Pandora) three times: Plut. *Romul.* 27, 1; Luc. *Quomodo hist. conscr. sit* 41 the historian should be ἄπολις, αὐτόνομος, ἀβασίλευτος; Greg. Nyss. *In inscript. Psalm.* 1, 8 (V 92). I believe one cannot prove the term ἀβασίλευτος is a relic from when Zeus founded the city, as was assumed by Zumschlinge, *Euhemerios* (1976), 239 and Müller, *Überlegungen* (1993), 292, n. 69. Relations between Hellenistic monarchies and nominally autonomous poleis are presented by Orth, *Königlicher Machtanspruch* (1977), esp. 179 ff. Orth considers it a mistake to assume the term αὐτόνομοι καὶ ἀβασίλευτοι in Euhemerus work to mean ‘eine Widerspiegelung des Zustandes ... in dem sich die Städte unter der Herrschaft der hellenistischen Könige realiter befunden hätten’.

57 Bichler, *Zur histor. Beurteilung* (1984), 188, n. 27. I am not convinced by the assumption of Honigman, *Euhemerios* (2009), 20, that the term αὐτόνομοι καὶ ἀβασίλευτοι ‘is a pastiche of – or a mere variation upon? – the well-known phrase describing political privileges that citizens of Greek *poleis* were granted by kings, αὐτόνομοι καὶ ἐλεύθεροι.’

the opinion that the island of Hieria was under the jurisdiction of the king of Panchaea.⁵⁸

On the basis of his assumption that Panchaea and Hieria were one and the same island, H. Braunert tried to prove yet another hypothesis.⁵⁹ He believed Panchaea had a constitution including monarchic, aristocratic and democratic elements to ensure that the balance between monarchy and polis was maintained and the rights of all social groups were respected. This would have been a very peculiar form of mixed constitution (*constitutio mixta*). Braunert's second hypothesis was analysed in detail and rightly rejected by Marianne Zumschlinge.⁶⁰ She pointed to the following: a) the king is essentially a figurehead and lacks the attributes that would make him an ideal ruler, b) the priests lack spiritual and moral excellence to which state leaders should aspire, c) the people have no rights and exert no influence on political matters. Hence I do not understand why Zumschlinge accepted, with reservation, Braunert's first hypothesis. After all, she herself considers the king to be a figurehead and concedes she cannot convincingly explain what the priests do with the money received from the sale of frankincense and myrrh.

It seems to me that Braunert's approach has some serious methodological shortcomings. After all, one cannot arbitrarily assume that Panchaea has a monarchy and on that basis consider Diodorus to be a mechanical compiler who erroneously combined diverse excerpts from Euhemerus' *Ἱερὰ Ἀναγραφή*.⁶¹ The text in the *Bibliotheca historica* is perfectly consistent even if it does not answer all the issues that interest us.

4. The 'sources' of the socio-economic description

Many scholars have thought that Euhemerus' socio-economic description betrays Egyptian or Indian influences.⁶² This, however, is based on the false assumption that Euhemerus must have had a real world society

58 Bertelli, *Il modello* (1976), 202, n. 77.

59 Braunert, *Staatstheorie* (1968), 54–66.

60 Zumschlinge, *Euhemerios* (1976), 114–179, 233–238. Braunert's theory was also rejected by Aalders, *Political Thought* (1975), 68 and Müller, *Überlegungen* (1993), 292, 299–300. Cf. Bichler, *Zur histor. Beurteilung* (1984), 204, 'In der "Heiligen Urkunde" dagegen lassen sich politische Ziele des Verfassers kaum mehr greifen.'

61 It is worth adding that some scholars wrongly questioned the value of Diodorus' account of the *theologia dipertita* in Euhemerus' work (VI 1, 1–2 = T 25). See chapter III 1.

62 Egyptian influences: e.g. Rostowzew, *Studien* (1910), 282–283; M. Gelzer, HZ 113, 1914, 105–106; Braunert, *Staatstheorie* (1968), 58–59; Aalders, *Political Thought* (1975), 68; Bertelli, *Il modello* (1976), 203–205; Müller, *Überlegungen* (1993), 298; Dillery, *Hecataeus* (1998), 270–272. Tarn, *Alexander* (1933), 43–44, rightly criticised Rostowzew and Gelzer's arguments by pointing out that Panchaeian society had none of the typical features of Ptolemaic Egypt. See Zumschlinge, *Euehemeros* (1976), 84

in mind. One has to remember that the division of Egyptian society had already been described by several well-known authors, including Herodotus, Plato, Isocrates and Hecataeus of Abdera.⁶³ Knowledge about the social groups in India had become widespread thanks to books written after Alexander the Great's expedition to the East, particularly Megasthenes' Ἰνδικά.⁶⁴ The division of society into three estates was already described by Hippodamus of Miletus in the second half of the 5th century,⁶⁵ and later, among others, by Plato and Isocrates.⁶⁶ Therefore it seems likely that educated Greeks had a general knowledge of Egypt and India and understood the concept of society being divided into three classes. Hence it is difficult to speak of any concrete sources to Euhemerus' socio-economic system. The author of the Ἱερὰ Ἀναγραφή most probably knew the works of writers such as Herodotus, Plato, Isocrates,⁶⁷ Onesicritus,⁶⁸

- 'nichts Wesentliches auf Aegypten hinweist.' Indian influences: Rohde, *Der gr. Roman* (1914), 240, n. 0; Finley, *Utopianism* (1967), 9, reprint in Finley, *The Use* (1975), 183.
- 63 Hdt. II 164, 1 (seven social groups); Pl. *Tim.* 24 A (six groups); Isocr. *Bus.* 16–18; Hecat. (FGrHist 264 F 25) ap. Diod. I 73, 2–74, 7 (six groups). It is, however, debatable as whether Diodorus, I 10–98, really expresses the views of Hecataeus. See chapter III 2 G. On the social division of the Egyptian society, see e.g. Froidefond, *Le mirage égyptien* (1971), 169 ff., 251 ff., 295 ff.; Burton, *Diodorus* (1972), 214–218; Lloyd, *Herodotus, Book II* (1993), 182–184.
- 64 Megasth. (FGrHist 715) F 4 ap. Diod. II 40, 1–41, 5; F 19 a ap. Arrian. *Ind.* 11, 1–12, 9; F 19 b ap. Str. XV 1, 39–49 p. 703–707 (seven groups). See Stein, *Megasthenes* (1921), 119–232; Breloer, *Megasthenes* (1934), 130–164; Sachse, *Megasthenes* (1981), 43–49, 54–58; Falk, *Die sieben 'Kasten'* (1982), 61–68; Zambrini, *Gli Indika* (1985), 806–823; Bosworth, *Alexander* (1996), 89–92; Karttunen, *India* (1997), 82–87. Megasthenes as Euhemerus' source: Brown, *Onesicritus* (1949), 66. On Indian castes, see e.g. Hutton, *Caste in India* (1947), esp. 41–115; Ruben, *Die gesellschaftliche Entwicklung* (1967), I, 69–85, 93–95.
- 65 Hippodamus (DK 39 A 1) ap. Arist. *Pol.* II, 1267 b 31–33 τεχνῖται, γεωργοί, τὸ προπολεμοῦν καὶ τὰ ὄπλα ἔχον. See e.g. Rispoli, *Ippodamo e Aristotele* (1975), 229–249; Szidat, *Hippodamos* (1980), 31–44; Triebel-Schubert, Muss, *Hippodamos* (1983/1984), 37–59; Gehrke, *Bemerkungen zu Hippodamos* (1989), 58–63; Schüttrumpf, *Aristoteles, Politik II–III* (1991), 259–282; Shipley, *Little Boxes* (2005), 335–403.
- 66 Pl. *Resp.* III 415 A–B ἄρχοντες, φύλακες, δημιουργοί – γεωργοί; *Crit.* 112 B δημιουργοί, γεωργοί, τὸ μάχιμον ... γένος, cf. 110 C; Isocr. *Bus.* 15 τοὺς μὲν ἐπὶ τὰς ἱερῶσύνas κατέστησε, τοὺς δ' ἐπὶ τὰς τέχνας ἔτρεψε, τοὺς δὲ τὰ περὶ τὸν πόλεμον μελετᾶν ἠνάγκασεν; Hecat. (FGrHist 264) F 25 ap. Diod. I 28, 5 εὐπατρίδαι, γεωμόροι, δημιουργοί et I 74, 1 νομεῖς, γεωργοί, τεχνῖται; Str. XVII 1, 3 p. 787 (FGrHist 665 F 92) στρατιῶται, γεωργοί, ἱερεῖς; Plut. *Thes.* 25, 2.
- 67 On Isocrates' *Busiris*, see Froidefond, *Le mirage égyptien* (1971), 237–266; Eucken, *Isokrates* (1983), 172–212; Bichler, *Von der Insel* (1995), 160–165, 229–231; Livingstone, *A Commentary on Isocrates' Busiris* (2001), esp. 1–90; Vasunia, *The Gift of the Nile* (2001), 183–215.
- 68 On Musicanus' state in Onesicritus' *How Alexander was Educated*, see Winiarczyk, *Die hellenist. Utopien* (2011), 102–115. On Onesicritus, see e.g. Berve, *Das Alexanderreich* (1926), II, 288–290; Strasburger, *Onesikritos* (1939), 460–467; Brown, *Onesicritus* (1949); Pearson, *The Lost Histories* (1960), 83–111; Pédech, *Histo-*

Nearchus,⁶⁹ Hecataeus of Abdera or Megasthenes, but Panchaeon society was Euhemerus' original invention. One cannot but agree with John Marincola in his opinion that 'response, reaction, innovation, and the competition with predecessors are some of the most important elements of ancient literary creation, whether in historiography or in any other genre.'⁷⁰ I nevertheless think that here we are speaking of literary reminiscences rather than sources *sensu stricto*.⁷¹

A much more important question is why Euhemerus presented a society with a collective economy and the lack of private ownership.⁷² It seems to me that the author of the *Ἱερὰ Ἀναγραφή* wanted his readers to believe that the island had preserved an archaic culture⁷³ which included common ownership as had once, long ago, existed on Crete and in Sparta. In Greece

riens (1984), 71–157; Winiarczyk, *Das Werk* (2007), 197–250; Müller, *Onesikritos* (2011), 45–66. On Onesicritus as Euhemerus' source, see Jacoby, *Euhemerios* (1907), 959–960; Brown, *Onesicritus* (1949), 70–71; van der Meer, *Euhemerus* (1949), 39; Paassen, *The Classical Tradition* (1957), 280.

69 Nearchus' work of an unknown title (see Winiarczyk, *Die hellenist. Utopien* [2011], 97, n. 126), described India and the voyage of Alexander's fleet along the coast of Persia from the mouth of the Indus to the mouth of the Euphrates (IX 325–III 324). On Nearchus, see e.g. Berve, *Das Alexanderreich* (1926), II, 269–272; Jacoby, *FGrHist II D* (1930), 445–468; Capelle, *Nearchos* (1935), 2135–2154; Pearson, *The Lost Histories* (1960), 112–149; Wirth, *Nearchos* (1971), 615–639, reprint in *idem*, *Studien* (1985), 51–75; Badian, *Nearchus* (1975), 147–170; Pédech, *Historiens* (1984), 159–214; Billows, *Antigonos* (1990), 406–408; Heckel, *The Marshals* (1992), 228–233; Heckel, *Who's Who* (2009), 171–173. On Nearchus as Euhemerus' source, see Jacoby, *loc. cit.*; Fraser, *Ptol. Alexandria* (1972), I, 289.

70 Marincola, *Genre, Convention* (1999), 299. Cf. 'Imitation was an accepted form of homage, but it was not to be simply a slavish copying of the model but the infusion of a new spirit into a traditional treatment' (*ibid.*). Also see *idem*, *Authority and Tradition* (1997), 12–19.

71 Already Hirzel, *Der Dialog* (1895), I, 391–393 and Bichler, *Zur histor. Beurteilung* (1984), 193–195 compared Panchaea with prehistoric Athens. More recently Honigsmann, *Euhemerus* (2009), 9–28, has tried to prove that the first part of Euhemerus' was 'an exercise in free re-writing based on Plato's Atlantis story'. Euhemerus was to apply 'creative adaptation' (p. 18) based on 'variation in vocabulary' and 'the principle of free composition' (p. 27). I believe her assumptions are wrong and the article does not contribute to a better understanding of Euhemerus' work.

72 On common ownership, see Bauer, *Essener* (1924), 411–414; Wacht, *Gütergemeinschaft* (1986), 1–23; Müller, *Überlegungen* (1993), 296–297. Aristotle names three types of common property: οἷον τὰ μὲν γήπεδα χωρίς, τοὺς δὲ καρποὺς εἰς τὸ κοινὸν φέροντες ἀναλίσκειν (ὅπερ ἕνια ποιεῖ τῶν ἐθνῶν), τουναντίον τὴν μὲν κοινὴν εἶναι καὶ γεωργεῖν κοινῇ, τοὺς δὲ καρποὺς διαρεῖσθαι πρὸς τὰς ἰδίας χρήσεις (λέγονται δὲ τινες καὶ τοῦτον τὸν τρόπον κοινῶν τῶν βαρβάρων), ἢ καὶ τὰ γήπεδα καὶ τοὺς καρποὺς κοινούς (*Pol.* II, 1263 a 3–8).

73 This was already pointed out by Pöhlmann, *Geschichte* (1925), II, 295 'eine uralte Kultur'. Similarly Zumschlinge, *Euhemerios* (1976), 85 'Urstaat' and Müller, *Überlegungen* (1993), 298 'die panchaiische Urkultur'. Another archaic feature was chariot warfare (Diod. V 45, 3 = T 35). Cf. Pl. *Crit.* 119 A; Diod. V 21, 5 (on the

the Cretan constitution was considered to be the oldest because Minos was to have received laws from his father Zeus.⁷⁴ Cretan law was in turn the model for the Spartan lawgiver Lycurgus.⁷⁵ Since according to the historian Ephorus common ownership had initially existed in Sparta,⁷⁶ it must have also existed on Crete. Another shared feature of both systems were common feasts (συσσίτια).⁷⁷ Moreover, Plato maintained that the lack of private ownership was also obligatory among soldiers in prehistoric Athens,⁷⁸ some 9,000 years before Solon, who had been told about the history of Atlantis and prehistoric Athens by an Egyptian priest (*Tim.* 23 D–25 D). One should remember that very early the Greeks began idealising noble savages living in distant lands.⁷⁹ Ever since Herodotus' day, ethnography and historiography considered common ownership a characteristic feature of all primitive

inhabitants of Britain); Caes. *Bell. Gall.* IV 24, 1; V 16, 2. See Nesselrath, *Platon, Kritias* (2006), 387–388.

74 Pl. *Leg.* I 624 AB.

75 Hdt. I 65, 4–5; Ephor. (FGrHist 70 F 149) ap. Str. X 4, 18 p. 481; Arist. *Pol.* II 1271 b 22–23; Ps.-Pl. *Min.* 320 A; Dion. Hal. *Ant. Rom.* II 23, 3; Paus. III 2, 4. Cf. Plut. *Lyc.* 4. See Trieber, *Forschungen* (1871), 81–104; Niese, *Herodot-Studien* (1907), esp. 442–443; van Effenterre, *La Crète* (1948), 77–84; Perlman, *Imagining Crete* (2005), 282–334; Link, *Aristoteles* (2008), 469–479. According to a different tradition Lycurgus received his laws from Pythia in Delphi (e.g. Hdt. I 65, 4; Paus. III 2, 4). On the account of Herodotus, see Thommen, *Lakedaimonion Politeia* (1996), 23–28.

76 Ephor. (FGrHist 70 F 148) ap. Polyb. VI 45, 3. See Walbank, *A Historical Commentary* (1957), I, 728–731.

77 συσσίτια (= ἀνδρεία, φιδότης) – Crete and Sparta: Ephor. (FGrHist 70 F 149) ap. Str. X 4, 16 p. 480; Arist. *Pol.* II 1272 a 12–21; Crete: Dosiades (FGrHist 458 F 2) ap. Athen. IV 22, 143 AD; Pyrgion (FGrHist 467 F 1) ap. Athen. IV 22, 143 EF; Nic. Dam. (FGrHist 90 F 103 aa) ap. Stob. *Anth.* IV 2, 25 (IV 162 Hense). Sparta: Alcmān, PMG fr. 98; Dicaearch. (fr. 72 Wehrli = fr. 87 Mirhady) ap. Athen. IV 19, 141 AB; Plut. *Lyc.* 12; Plut. *Quaest. conv.* VII 1, 714 B. See Nilsson, *Die Grundlagen* (1912), 315–319; Pöhlmann, *Geschichte* (1925), I, 46–61; Mitchell, *Sparta* (1964), 281–297; Hodkinson, *Social Order* (1983), 251–254; Meier, *Aristokraten* (1998), 170–183, esp. 175 ff.; Thommen, *Sparta* (2003), 130–132; Welwei, *Sparta* (2004), 79–85.

78 Pl. *Crit.* 110 CD. Plato had common ownership in the first two social classes in his *Πολιτεία* (*Resp.* III 416 D sqq.; V 464 B sqq.; cf. *Tim.* 18 B), but decided not to use it in the *Laws*, saying that it could only exist among gods and the sons of gods (*Leg.* V 739 D). He felt a more realistic concept would be the division of land into allotments that were nevertheless considered ‘the common ownership of everyone in the state’ (*Leg.* V 740 A).

79 On the idealisation of primitive peoples, see Riese, *Die Idealisierung der Naturvölker* (1875), 3–46; Trüdinger, *Studien* (1918), 133–146; Schroeder, *De ethnographiae antiquae locis* (1921), 30–45; Lovejoy, Boas, *Primitivism* (1935), 287–367 (‘The noble savage in antiquity’); Gatz, *Weltalter* (1967), 189–200; Ferguson, *Utopias* (1975), 16–22; Kindstrand, *Anacharsis* (1981), 23–26; Romm, *The Edges* (1992), 45–81; Bichler, *Von der Insel* (1995), 16–39; Schneider, *L'Éthiopie et l'Inde* (2004), 100–109.

cultures,⁸⁰ along with their simple and just way of life. The Greeks realised that the commodity money economy was a relatively new phenomenon (Hdt. I 94, 1) which emerged only in the later stages of civilizational development.⁸¹ The tradition of common ownership was also known among the Pythagoreans in Magna Graecia.⁸² Ephorus wrote about common ownership among the Scythians, whereas Nearchus mentioned collective farming being practiced by some of the Indian tribes.⁸³ Later Diodorus Siculus wrote about common ownership on the Lipari Islands⁸⁴ and also mentioned the collective economy of the Celtic Vaccae in Spain.⁸⁵ From the above cited facts we can see that the concept of common ownership was well known to the Greeks. That is why I think it is wrong to assume Euhemerus must have taken the idea from a specific author.⁸⁶ When we bear in mind that common ownership had existed among Cretans, Scythians and Indians, we may conclude it was for these very reasons Euhemerus described Panchaeon society as having a collective economy and no private ownership.⁸⁷ It is interesting that Panchaeon society did not have a collective ownership of women and children though this did exist among primitive peoples, such as the Scythians.

It seems to me that Euhemerus deliberately presented an archaic society which was entirely self-sufficient and had no contacts with the outside

80 Wacht, *Gütergemeinschaft* (1986), 13.

81 Cf. Plato's description of the emergence of the state (*Leg.* III 676 A – 681 D) with that of Dicaearchus (fr. 49 Wehrli = fr. 56 A Mirhady) ap. Porph. *De abst.* IV 2, 1–9.

82 Timaeus, FGrHist 566 F 13 ab; Iambl. *Vita Pyth.* 29–30, 72, 81, 257. See Minar, *Pythagorean Communism* (1944), 34–46; Riedweg, *Pythagoras* (2002), 56, 58, 134. Some scholars, however, question the reliability of Timaeus' account regarding common ownership of property among Pythagoreans in Magna Graecia. Thus e.g. von Fritz, *Mathematiker und Akusmatiker* (1960), 8–10; Philip, *Pythagoras* (1966), 142–143; Zhmud, *Pythagoras* (2012), 149–150.

83 Ephor. (FGrHist 70 F 42) ap. Str. VII 3, 9 p. 302 κοινὰ πάντα ἔχοντες τὰ τε ἄλλα καὶ τὰς γυναῖκας καὶ τέκνα καὶ τὴν ὅλην συγγένειαν. Cf. Ps.-Scymnus, *Orb. descr.* 856–857 (GGM I 232), *Peripl. Ponti Eux.* 49 (GGM I 413). According to Nearchus (FGrHist 133 F 23 ap. Str. XV 1, 66 p. 717) some Indian tribes farmed land collectively and then shared the crops evenly among themselves but destroyed whatever remained so as to motivate themselves to continue working.

84 Diod. V 9, 4–5. See e.g. Reinach, *Le collectivisme* (1890), 86–96; Kazarow, *Der liparische Kommunistenstaat* (1903), 157–160; Pöhlmann, *Geschichte* (1925), I, 36–41; Buck, *Communalism on Lipari Islands* (1959), 35–39; Figueira, *The Lipari Islanders* (1984), 179–206.

85 Diod. V 34, 3. The collective economy was also present among the Dalmatians (Str. VII 5, 5 p. 315) and Suebi (Caes. *Bell. Gall.* IV 1). Testimonies regarding collective ownership among various peoples are listed by Winiarczyk, *Die hellenist. Utopien* (2011), 250–252.

86 De Angelis, Garstad, *Euhemerus* (2006), 225–230 believe that Euhemerus based his account on the collective economy of the inhabitants of the Lipari Islands near Sicilian Messene.

87 This was already pointed out by Müller, *Überlegungen* (1993), 297.

world, so that it would be easier to believe that on the island there still existed a stele recounting the achievements of its deified rulers Uranus, Cronus and Zeus.⁸⁸ The priests who guarded the stele in the temple of Zeus Triphylus were not allowed to leave the temenos,⁸⁹ which helped the text, written in a form similar to Egyptian hieroglyphs, to be kept secret.⁹⁰

5. Summary

Euhemerus presented two quite different socio-political systems. The island of Hieria had a monarchy. There the land was not divided evenly among the inhabitants and the king, who already possessed much more land than anyone else, also received a tithe of other inhabitants' crops. The economy was based on the export of frankincense and myrrh. The money gained from this export was used by the islanders to purchase all they needed, as the island had no other riches. The existence of private ownership and individual trade no doubt led to social stratification.

The situation was quite different on the island of Panchaea. Society was divided into three levels. At the top were the priests, who rose to power after the dynasty founded by Zeus died out. The people had no private property, with the exception of the farmers and shepherds, who had their own houses and gardens, thanks to which they were able to lead normal family lives. The priests were confined to a large temenos, while the soldiers lived in strongholds. The economy was collective, since the shepherds and farmers submitted their livestock and crops to be distributed among the inhabitants by the priests. Common ownership and collective economy are the features of an archaic community. Panchaea had a typical closed society that was entirely self-sufficient and had no contacts with the outside world. Euhemerus deliberately presented such an archaic society so that the reader would find it easier to believe in the preservation of a stele recounting the deeds of Uranus, Cronus and Zeus.

In my opinion, Euhemerus did not base his Ἱερὰ Ἀναγραφὴ on the work of any particular author. Like all educated Greeks, he had a general knowledge of Egypt and India and he also knew the concept of society being divided into three groups. He had most probably read the works of Herodotus, Plato, Isocrates, Onesicritus, Nearchus, Hecataeus of Abdera and Megasthenes, but Panchaeian society is of his own original invention. One may speak of literary similarities and reminiscences but not of literary sources *sensu stricto*.

88 Müller, *op. cit.*, 299, came to the same conclusion.

89 Diod. V 46, 4 = T 35.

90 Diod. V 46, 7 = T 37.

V. The Zeus Sanctuary on the Island of Panchaea

1. The temple and temenos

The inhabitants of Panchaea were exceptionally pious and the centre of their religious cult was the sanctuary of Zeus Triphylus,¹ where great sacrifices to the gods were laid.² Located 60 stades (i.e. almost 12 km) from Panara, the temple stood on a hill surrounded by a plain.³ Its length and width were the same, measuring two plethra, i.e. over 60 m. Built of white stone and supported on very tall, massive columns. There was a frieze of fine workmanship,⁴ the doors were of silver, gold, ivory and precious citron wood.⁵ Inside the temple there were statues of the gods⁶ as well as numerous votive offerings of silver and gold.⁷ The most important item was the golden stele standing near the Zeus' bed (κλίνη) and table, on which the sacrifices to him were laid.⁸

- 1 $\text{ἱερὸν Διὸς Τριφυλίου}$ (Diod. V 42, 6 = T 38; VI 1, 6 = T 36); templum Triphylī Iovis (Serv. *Verg. Georg.* II 139 = T 32 B; fanum Iovis Triphylī (Lact. *Div. inst.* I 11, 33 = T 65). The Τριφυλία land of the Τριφύλιοι people existed on the Peloponnese: Xen. *Hell.* IV 2, 16; VI 5, 2; VII 1, 26; Demosth. *Or.* 16, 16; Str. VIII 3, 3 p. 337; Dion. Per. *Orb. descr.* 409 (GGM II 128); Steph. Byz. s.v. Τριφυλία; Hesych. s.v. Τρίφυλοι; Eustath. *Comm. in Dion. Orb. descr.* 409 (GGM II 292). See Bölte, *Triphylia* (1939), 186–201.
- 2 Diod. VI 1, 5 = T 3 τοὺς ἐνοικοῦντας Παγχαίους εὐσεβεῖα διαφέροντας καὶ τοὺς θεοὺς τιμῶντας μεγαλοπρεπεστάταις θυσίαις. The various peoples considered to be pious in ancient times are listed by Winiarczyk, *Die hellenist. Utopien* (2011), 244–247.
- 3 Description of temple and temenos: T 36 (VI 1, 6–7), T 37 (V 46, 5–7), T 38 (V 42, 6–44, 5). Diodorus variously describes the location of the temple. In V 42, 6 (T 38) κείμενον μὲν ἐν χώρᾳ πεδιάδι, but in VI 1, 6 (T 36) κατὰ τινα λόφον ὑψηλὸν καθ' ὑπερβολήν. However, already Némethy, *Euhemeri reliquiae* (1889), 77, explained this apparent contradiction 'nos igitur secundum Euhemerum circa templum Iovis regionem planam fuisse ... sed ipsum fanum in tumulo quodam exstructum longe eminuisse arbitramur'. Similarly van Gils, *Quaestiones* (1902), 94.
- 4 Diod. V 44, 1 = T 38 γλυφαῖς φιλοτέχνοις διελημμένους.
- 5 Diod. V 46, 6 = T 37. The θύα (= citrus) tree grew in Mauretania (Lucan. X 144; Mart. II 43, 9) and was used for incrustation (Plin. *Nat. hist.* XVI 42). According to Athen. V 40, 207 E, the doors were made out of θύα and ivory. See Block, *Evhémère* (1876), 29, n. 3.
- 6 Diod. V 44, 1 = T 38.
- 7 Diod. V 46, 5 = T 37; VI 1, 5 = T 3.
- 8 On cult tables, see Mischkowski, *Die heiligen Tische* (1917); Dow, Gill, *The Greek Cult Table* (1965), 103–114; Gill, *The Classical Greek Cult Table* (1965), 265–269;

Leading from the temple is a dromos, four stades long and one plethron wide.⁹ On either side of this esplanade there are either bronze statues or bronze vases (χαλκεῖα μεγάλα) standing on square bases.¹⁰ Near the end of the dromos there is a fresh water spring,¹¹ the source of a river called the Water of the Sun (Ἡλίου ὕδωρ),¹² which irrigates the entire temenos. The spring is surrounded by a stone enclosure (κρηπίς λιθίνη), measuring four stades on all sides, into which only the priests have access.¹³ The plain surrounding the temple is 200 stades (almost 40 km) long. On the plain there are many types of trees, including cypresses, plane trees, laurels, balsa trees, palm trees and hazel. There are also grapevines and meadows covered with flowers. The area is inhabited by diverse animals, such as elephants, lions,

Goudineau, *Hierai trapezai* (1967), 77–134; Gill, *Greek Cult Tables* (1991); van Straten, *Hierà kalá* (1995), 154–155, 164–165.

- 9 The dromos appeared in temples on Delos, in Delphi and Didyma. See Wachsmuth, *Dromos* (1905), 1716–1717. The dromos in Egyptian temples is described by Str. XVII 1, 28 p. 805.
- 10 Diod. V 44, 2–3 = T 38. See Wesseling, *Diodori Siculi* (1798), III, 598 ‘χαλκεῖα i.e. statuæ ex aere aut vasa ahenea’. He referred to Δωδωναῖον χαλκίον in Steph. Byz. s.v. Δωδώνη. Cf. Dieterle, *Dodona* (2007), 170–181.
- 11 Diod. V 43, 2 πηγὴ γλυκέος ὕδατος; see Dion. Scyt. F 8 ap. Diod. III 69, 1 πάντῃ δὲ κατὰ τὰς παρόδους προχεῖσθαι πηγὰς ὑδάτων τῇ γλυκύτητι διαφόρων, cf. Diod. III 68, 5 and Iambul. ap. Diod. II 57, 3 εἶναι δὲ καὶ πηγὰς ὑδάτων δαφνιεῖς, τὰς μὲν θερμῶν εἰς λουτρὰ καὶ κόπων ἀφαίρεσιν εὐθέτους, τὰς δὲ ψυχρῶν, τῇ γλυκύτητι διαφόρους καὶ πρὸς ὑγίειαν συνεργεῖν δυναμένας. See n. 14 below. On the significance of water in purification rites, see e.g. Rohde, *Psyche* (1925), II, 405–406; Cole, *The Uses of Water* (1988), 161–165; Nilsson, *Geschichte* (1988), I, 103; Parker, *Miasma* (1996), 226–227; Burkert, *Griechische Religion* (2011), 124–127; cf. Ninck, *Die Bedeutung des Wassers* (1921), 153, n. 1. Springs appear in the temenos of Argos (Heraion): Paus. II 17, 1; Athens, θάλασσα on the Acropolis: Hdt. VIII 55; Pl. *Crit.* 112 D (see Nesselrath, *Platon, Kritias* [2006], 235); Delphi, Κασσοῖς; Paus. X 24, 7 (cf. Roux, *Delphi* [1971], 126–134) and Κασταλία: Paus. X 8, 9; Didyma: Iambl. *De myst.* III 11 p. 114 Des Places; Dodona: Mela II 43; Plin. *Nat. hist.* II 228; Aug. *Civ. Dei* XXI 5; Eleusis, Καλλίχορον: *Hymn. Hom. Cer.* 272, Paus. I 38, 6 (cf. Richardson, *The Homeric Hymn* [1974], 326–328); Claros: Iambl. *De myst.* III 11 p. 112 Des Places; the Siwah Oasis (Ammoneion): Hdt. IV 181, 4; Lucr. VI 848; Diod. XVII 50, 3–4; Ovid. *Met.* XV 309–310; Plin. *Nat. hist.* II 228 et V 31; Mela I 39; Val. Max. VIII 15 ext. 3; Arrian. *Anab.* III 4, 2; Curt. Ruf. IV 7, 22; Aug. *Civ. Dei* XXI 5; Tegea (Athena Alea): Paus. VIII 47, 4.
- 12 The Spring of the Sun in the temple of Ammon in the Siwah Oasis was described among others by: Hdt. IV 181, 4 ἡ κρήνη καλέεται Ἡλίου; Diod. XVII 50, 4 Ἡλίου κρήνη; Mela I 39 ‘fons quem Solis adpellant’; Plin. *Nat. hist.* V 31; Curt. Ruf. IV 7, 22 ‘Est et aliud Hammonis nemus: in medio habet fontem – Solis aquam vocant’. See Bidez, *La cité du monde* (1932), 44 with n. 3.
- 13 Diod. V 44, 3–4 = T 38. Places in sanctuaries to which ordinary people were denied access (οὐκ ἔστι βάσιμος) are described by: Hdt. III 37; Pl. *Crit.* 116 C; Paus. II 10, 2 et 4; VI 20, 3; VIII 10, 3; VIII 31, 5; VIII 36, 3; VIII 38, 6. See Hewitt, *The Major Restrictions* (1909), 83–91; Herzog, *Abaton* (1950), 8–9; Nesselrath, *Platon, Kritias* (2006), 328–329.

panthers, antelope as well as fabulously coloured singing birds. The temenos is so lovely and delightful that people willingly go there in the summer to most probably relax in the shade of trees, admire the beauty of nature and bathe in the river, whose waters have healing properties.¹⁴ The temenos possibly also has mines of silver, gold, copper, tin and iron, but these metals cannot be exported from the island.¹⁵ The entire temenos area is devoted to gods and all its revenues go to the religious cult.¹⁶

Some scholars believed that Euhemerus based his description of the Zeus Triphylus sanctuary on Egyptian temples. Common features included massive columns and a dromos.¹⁷ Moreover, it was believed that Euhemerus saw such temples during his supposed stay in Egypt.¹⁸ Other scholars think that Euhemerus had in mind a Greek Doric temple.¹⁹ I believe that neither side in this debate is convincing as the dromos and massive columns were a feature of temple architecture in both Egypt and Greece. Moreover, some scholars are of the opinion that the Greeks actually copied the idea of monumental architecture and colonnades from the Egyptians.²⁰ Hence I believe we are unable to say what actually inspired Euhemerus. His description of the temple is most probably original. Let us add that there is more than one description of temple in a temenos in ancient literature. For example Plato describes the temple of Poseidon on Atlantis, and Hecataeus of Abdera the

14 Diod. V 44, 3 = T 38 ἔστι δὲ τὸ φερόμενον ῥέῃμα τῇ λευκότητι καὶ γλυκότητι διαφέρον, πρὸς τε τὴν τοῦ σώματος ὑγίειαν συμβαλλόμενον τοῖς χρωμένοις. See n. 11.

15 Diod. V 46, 4 = T 35 ἔχει δ' ἡ χώρα μέταλλα δαψιλῇ χρυσοῦ τε καὶ ἀργύρου καὶ χαλκοῦ καὶ καττιτέρου καὶ σιδήρου. Cf. Plin. *Nat. hist.* VII 197 = T 81 'auri metalla et flaturam Cadmus Phoenix ad Pangaeum montem, ut alii, Thasus aut Aeacus in Panchaia aut Sol Oceani filius'; Hyg. *Fab.* 274, 4 = T 82 A 'Aeacus Iovis filius in Panchaia in monte Taso aurum primus invenit'. See my commentary to Euhem. T 81–82 A. Pl. *Crit.* 114 E also writes about precious metals on Atlantis.

16 Diod. V 44, 4 = T 38.

17 Fraser, *Ptol. Alexandria* (1972), I, 293; Nilsson, *Geschichte* (1988), II, 287. On the other hand, also see a good point made by Dillery, *Hecataeus* (1998), 271 'less securely, the temple itself of Zeus Triphylus has an Egyptian aspect ... To be sure, none of these elements has to be Egyptian'.

18 Euhemerus' supposed stay in Egypt was accepted, among others, by Braunert, *Staats-theorie* (1968), 58; Müller, *Geschichte* (1972), 267; Müller, *Überlegungen* (1993), 297; Weber, *Dichtung* (1993), 147, n. 1.

19 Zumschlinge, *Euhemerus* (1976), 34–35.

20 Marinatos, *What Were Greek Sanctuaries?* (1993), 229. She also approves of the hypothesis proposed by Burkert, *The Formation of Greek Religion* (1992), 545, who argues that the Greeks started building temples in the 8th century BC, copying the late Hittite, Aramaic and Phoenician temples in Cilicia, Syria and Palestine. Burkert and Marinatos reject the traditional evolutionary approach, according to which the Greek temple developed from the Mycenaean megaron. Also see Østby, *Der Ursprung* (2001), 17–33.

temple of Apollo on the island of Helixoia in the land of the Hyperboreans.²¹ Likewise Longus (2nd century BC) writes about the temple of Dionysus on the island of Lesbos in his novel *Daphnis and Chloe* (IV 2–3).

The description of the temenos on Panchaea is similar to that of nature on other utopian islands, e.g. Plato's Atlantis or Iambulus' Island of the Sun.²² For a long time it was thought that ancient authors were inspired by their predecessors and it was therefore a matter of establishing which particular themes originated from particular authors.²³ Then E.R. Curtius put forward a hypothesis according to which the literary convention called *locus amoenus* had existed from the time of Homer to that of the Roman Empire.²⁴ Let us remember that it appears not only in descriptions of utopian islands but also of the land of the dead (the Blessed Isles and Elysium) as well as the golden age.²⁵ I accept this argument and therefore see no point in searching for a source on which Euhemerus supposedly based his description of nature on the island of Panchaea.

2. The stele in the temple

A. The account on the stele

The golden stele bore an inscription in Panchaeian writing, which resembled Egyptian hieroglyphs.²⁶ The deeds of Uranus, Cronus and Zeus

21 Pl. *Crit.* 116 C – 117 A (see Nesselrath, *Plato* [2006], 331–345); Hecat. (FGrHist 264 F 7) ap. Diod. II 47, 2.

22 Diod. II 56, 7–57, 3. See Winiarczyk, *Die hellenist. Utopien* (2011), 181–203.

23 Some scholars believe Euhemerus based his description on Plato's Atlantis and pre-historic Athens. See chapter IV 4, n 71.

24 Curtius, *Europäische Literatur* (1948), 191–209. On the *locus amoenus*, see chapter II 4 B.

25 See Gernet, *La cité future* (1933), 293–310.

26 Diod. VI 1, 7 = T 36 ἐν τούτῳ τῷ ἱερῷ στήλην εἶναι χρυσῆν, ἐν ᾗ τοῖς Παγχαίοις γράμμασιν ὑπάρχειν γεγραμμένας τὰς τε Οὐρανοῦ καὶ Κρόνου καὶ Διὸς πράξεις κεφαλαιωδῶς; V 46, 7 = T 37 στήλη χρυσὴ μεγάλη, γράμματα ἔχουσα τὰ παρ' Αἰγυπτίοις ἱερὰ καλούμενα. This is in reference to the same hieroglyph inscribed column, as already noted by Gils, *Quaestiones* (1902), 95. Brown, *Euhemerus* (1946), 261, n. 11, is wrong to write of two different columns. Cf. Plut. *Is. et Os.* 23, 360 A (T 15) and Lact. *Div. inst.* I 11, 33 (T 65) 'in fano Iovis Triphyliae, ubi auream columnam positam esse ab ipso Iove titulus indicabat, in qua columna sua gesta perscripsit, ut monumentum posteris esset rerum suarum'. The ἀναγραφαί that priests showed to Euhemerus (V 46, 3 = T 35) are another reference to the stele inscription, as correctly stated by Wesseling, *Diodori* (1798), III, 600 and Jacoby, *Euemerus* (1907), 963, whereas Sieroka was wrong to state in *De Euhemero* (1869), 13, n. 0, 'praeter inscriptiones sacerdotes Euhemero monstrabant commentarios a Iove conditos'. γράμματα ... ἱερὰ καλούμενα = τὰ ἱερογλυφικὰ γράμματα,

were inscribed on the instructions of Zeus himself,²⁷ whereas the deeds of Artemis and Apollo²⁸ were added later by Hermes.²⁹ It seems that a history of the rulers accounts for the main part of the *Ἱερὰ Ἀναγραφή*. Referring to tradition of theogonic poetry, Euhemerus presented an original politico-historical theogony of his own.³⁰ The first ruler of the world was Uranus (Caelus),³¹ a noble man performing benefactions for others. He understood the movements of the stars, which he observed from the top of a mountain called Uranus' Throne (Οὐρανοῦ θρόνος) or Triphylian Olympus. He was the first to make offerings to the gods of heaven (οὐράνιοι θεοί) and that is why he was called Uranus.³² His wife was Hestia (Vesta), his sons Titan and Cronus (Saturnus), and his daughters were Rhea (Ops) and Demeter (Ceres). When he died, his body was buried in the city of Aulacia. His younger son, Cronus, succeeded him as king.³³ His older son Titan was persuaded by his mother and sisters not to rule, but he did so on a condition: after Cronus' death, Titan's son was to become king. Cronus promised to kill any of his own sons borne by Rhea. However, he did not keep his word and kept secret from Titan the births of Zeus, Poseidon and Hades. When Titan learned of this, he imprisoned Cronus and his wife. Zeus then arrived from Crete and freed his parents. After defeating Titan and his sons in combat, he restored his father to the throne and returned to Crete. Yet now, instead of being

cf. Pl. *Tim.* 23 E, 27 B; Hecat. (FGrHist 264) F 25 ap. Diod. I 55, 7 (Αἰγυπτίοις γράμμασι τοῖς ἱεροῖς λεγομένοις) and F 5 ap. Plut. *Is. et Os.* 6, 353 B (=DK 73 B 11); Philo, *Vita Mos.* I 23 (IV 125 Cohn); Leo (FGrHist 659 F 3) ap. Aug. *Civ. Dei* XII 11 'ex litteris quae sacrae apud illos haberentur'. See Reitzenstein, *Poimandres* (1904), 124, n. 1; Harder, *Karpokrates* (1944), 25 with n. 1; Jacoby, *FGrHist III a* (1958), 83; Bergman, *Ich bin Isis* (1968), 29, n. 0. Wrongly Otto, Bengtson, *Zur Geschichte* (1938), 83, 'überhaupt alte Vorlage'. Cf. Democr. (DK 68 A 33) ap. Diog. Laert. IX 49 Περί τῶν ἐν Βαβυλῶνι ἱερῶν γραμμάτων and Περί τῶν ἐν Μερῶν <ἱερῶν γραμμάτων>. Also see Schrenk, *γράμματα* (1933), 763 'ἱερὰ oder θεῖα γράμματα für kaiserliche Briefe und Erlasse, als ein in der östlichen Welt üblicher terminus'; Colpe, *Heilige Schriften* (1987), 185–186; Henrichs, *Hieroi logoi* (2003), 225–226, n. 60 and 241, n. 120.

27 Diod. V 46, 3 (T 37).

28 Diod. V 46, 7 (T 37).

29 Hermes, identified with the Egyptian god Thoth, was considered the inventor of writing. See e.g. Pl. *Phaedr.* 274 CD; Pl. *Phileb.* 18 BC; Hecat. (FGrHist 264 F 25) ap. Diod. I 16, 1; *Aret. Isid.* 3c καὶ γράμματα εἶρον μετὰ Ἑρμοῦ (cf. Peek, *Der Isishymnos* [1930], 31–34; Rusch, *Thoth* [1936], 351–388; Müller, *Ägypten* [1961], 22–25; Bergman, *Ich bin Isis* [1968], 234–237; Kurth, *Thor* [1986], 497–523); Cic. *Nat. deor.* III 56; Philo (FGrHist 790 F 2) ap. Eus. *Praep. ev.* I 10, 14. Wrongly Stephens, *Seeing Double* (2003), 37.

30 Thraede, *Euhemerismus* (1966), 879. Cf. Müller, *Überlegungen* (1993), 288 'eine rationalisierte Theogonie' and chapter II 5, n. 48.

31 On Uranus, see Euhem. T 49–52.

32 Diod. VI 1, 8 (T 49). See chapter II 5, n. 67.

33 On Cronus, see Euhem. T 53 – 55.

grateful to his son, Cronus wanted to treacherously kill him, because the oracle had told him that Zeus would one day deprive him of his kingship. Zeus, however, managed to escape the trap and forced his father to flee. Cronus eventually found refuge in Latium in Italy. Zeus (Juppiter) became the third ruler of the world.³⁴ He had three wives: Hera, Demeter and Themis. His first wife bore him the Curetes, the second Persephone and the third Athena. Zeus set out on a number journeys. First he travelled to Babylonia, where he met Belus.³⁵ Later on Panchaea he built an altar on which he laid an offering to his grandfather Uranus. Next he travelled to Syria, where he met Casius. In Cilicia he defeated the ruler Cilix. He also visited many other places where he established friendly relations with various rulers. Before he left a place, he would have a temple built in his name, and to it would be added the name of the local host.³⁶ The local rulers agreed to this willingly as this way their names would be immortalised too and even gain religious sanction. Thus were built the temples of Zeus Ataburius, Casius, Labrayndius, Laprius and Molio.³⁷ Moreover, on Panchaea Zeus built the *templum Triphylii Iovis*. Zeus therefore consciously created his own religious cult, in other words he performed self-deification, and hence set an example for others to follow.³⁸ He circumnavigated the oikoumene five times, entrusting

34 On Zeus, see Euhem. T 56 – 69 B.

35 See T 61 = Diod. VI 1, 10 ap. Eus. *Praep. ev.* II 2, 61 ἐπιξενωθῆναι (scil. τὸν Δία) Βῆλω. On Iuppiter Belus/Ζεὺς Βῆλος, see Hdt. I 181, 2; Ctesias (FGrHist 688 F 1 b) ap. Diod. II 8, 7 et II 9, 4; Berossus (FGrHist 680 F 12) ap. Agath. *Hist.* II 24, 8; Plin. *Nat. hist.* VI 121; Philo Bybl. (FGrHist 790 F 2) ap. Eus. *Praep. ev.* I 10, 26; Cass. Dio, LXXVIII 8, 5 (III 411 Boissevain); Mart. Cap. VI 701; Hesych. s.v. Βῆλος; See Tümpel, *Belos* (1899), 259–264; Cook, *Zeus* (1914), I, 756, n. 6.

36 Lact. *Div. inst.* I 22, 22 (T 64 A) ‘ut in quamque regionem venerat, reges principesve populorum hospitio sibi et amicitia copulabat, et cum a quoque digrederetur, iubebat sibi fanum creari hospitis sui nomine, quasi ut posset amicitiae ac foederis memoria conservari.’

37 See chapter II 5, n. 68.

38 Many scholars rightly judge that Euhemerus wrote about the deification of Uranus after his death and Zeus’ self-deification, e.g. Jacoby, *Euemerios* (1907), 964–965; Valauri, *Origine* (1960), 15–16; Müller, *Geschichte* (1972), 267. Only Schwartz, *Hekataeos* (1885), 260, maintained that in the Ἱερὰ Ἀναγραφὴ there was no mention of self-deification. A.D. Nock, rev. van der Meer, CW 44, 1950, 89, wrongly argued that Zeus was deified after his death out of gratitude. Wrong too was Thraede, *Euhemerismus* (1966), 879, in maintaining that the work did not mention Zeus’ ‘Selbstkonsekration’. The grounds for Zeus’ self-deification were his authority over the oikoumene and euergetism. See Lact. *Div. inst.* I 22, 26 (T 64 A) ‘hoc modo religionem cultus sui per orbem terrae Iuppiter seminavit et exemplum ceteris ad imitandum dedit’. Müller, *Überlegungen* (1993), 280–281 overemphasises Zeus’ regal authority. On the significance of benefactions, see Lact. *Div. inst.* I 13, 2 (T 66) ‘verum primum Iovem leges hominibus moresque condentem edicto prohibuisse, ne liceret eo cibo (scil. humana carne) vesci’; Lact. *ibid.* I 11, 35 (T 67) ‘ad eum (scil. Iovem) in ius veniebant, si quae res in controversia erant. Item si quis quid novi invenerat quod ad vitam humanam

rule to friends and relatives in various parts of the world. He gave people laws and customs (See chapter II 5, n. 50–51). Later he stayed mainly on Mount Olympus in Panchaea. People who had invented something useful would go there to show Zeus and obtain his approval. People would also ask him to resolve various disputes. Zeus died in old age on Crete. His sons buried him in Knossos, a place founded by Hestia the wife of Uranus. On the gravestone they inscribed ZAN KPONOY, meaning Zeus, son of Cronus.³⁹ We know little about the actions of other deities. Aphrodite studied astronomy and encouraged the women of Cyprus to engage in prostitution.⁴⁰

B. Ἱερὸς λόγος on the stele

Ancient Greek literature frequently mentions steles in temples.⁴¹ Herodotus states that there were two steles in the temple of Heracles/Melqart in Tyre,⁴² and Plato writes about a stele in the temple of Poseidon on Atlantis,⁴³

utile esset, eo veniebant atque ostendebant'; Lact. *ibid.* I 11, 45 (T 69 A) 'hominibus leges mores frumentaue paravit multaue alia bona fecit, immortalis gloria memoriae adfectus sempiterna monumenta sui reliquit'. See my commentary to Euhem. T 66 (a, b).

39 The ZAN form appears in the Doric dialect. Cf. Callim. *Iamb.* I 10 (T 1 A) Ζᾶνα; Porph. *Vita Pyth.* 17 ὁδὲ θανὼν κεῖται Ζάν, ὃν Δία κυκλήσκουσιν; *Comm. Bern. Lucan.* VIII 872 'ostendunt tumulum et lapidem sub hac inscriptione ZAN (codd. TAN) KPONOY.' Other versions of the inscription are in my commentary to Euhem. T 69 A (ad l. 9). See Cook, *Zeus* (1925), II, 350–354 and Schindler, *Zeus* (1978), 1001. Inscriptions on the tombs of kings were described by the historians of Alexander the Great: Onesicritus (FGrHist 134) F 34 ap. Str. XV 3, 7 p. 730 (Cyrus), F 35 ap. Str. XV 3, 8 p. 730 (Darius); Nearchus (133 F 31) ap. Curt. Ruf. X 1, 14 'esse haud procul a continenti insulam palmis frequentibus consitam et in medio fere nemore columnam eminere, Erythri regis monumentum, litteris gentis eius scriptam'; Aristobulus (139 F 51) ap. Arrian. *Anab.* VI 29, 4–8 (Cyrus).

40 On Aphrodite, see Euhem. T 74–75 B.

41 On steles, see e.g. Reitzenstein, *Poimandres* (1904), 363–364; Ganszyniec, *Der Ursprung der Zehngebote Tafeln* (1920); Norden, *Die germanische Urgeschichte* (1923), 183–189; Ganszyniec, *Der Ursprung* (1923/24), 354–356; Festugière, *La révélation* (1950), I, 319–324; Speyer, *Angebliche Übersetzungen* (1968/69), 29–32, reprint in Speyer, *Frühes Christentum* (1989), 73–76; Speyer, *Bücherfunde* (1970), 111–122; Hengel, *Judentum und Hellenismus* (1988), 443–445; Fehling, *Herodotus and His 'Sources'* (1989), 133–140, 170–174.

42 Hdt. II 44, 1–2. Cf. Lloyd, *Herodotus* (1976), 205–206. See Theophr. *De lapid.* IV 25; Plin. *Nat. hist.* XXXVII 75 'esse in Tyro Herculis templo stelen amplam e smaragdo.' Steles dedicated to Heracles in a temple in Gades are described by Philostr. *Vita Apoll.* V 5. See Georgiadou, Larmour, *Lucian's Science Fiction Novel* (1998), 70–71. According to Theophr. *Ad Autol.* III 2, 4 Pythagoras was to have discovered a stele dedicated to Heracles.

43 Pl. *Crit.* 119 CD καὶ γράμματα ὑπὸ τῶν πρώτων ἐν στήλῃ ὀρειχαλκίνη, κατὰ μέσσην τὴν νῆσον ἔκειτ' ἐν ἱερῷ Ποσειδῶνος. The temple was one stade long and three

bearing this god's instructions as inscribed by the island's first rulers. In the aretalogies of Isis there is mention of a stele in the temple of Hephaestus/Ptah in Memphis.⁴⁴ None other than Apollo was to have inscribed his own teachings on the stele in the Delphic temple.⁴⁵ We also know of the steles of Hermes in Egyptian temples.⁴⁶

According to Philo of Byblos (1st–2nd century AD), Sanchuniathon, who was to have lived before the Trojan War, discovered a previously unknown stele in the temple of Ammon.⁴⁷ The theme of discovering a stele disclosing a religious message or some arcane philosophical knowledge was very popular, particularly in the Hellenistic period and at the time of the Roman Empire. It appears not only among pagans but also in Jewish and Gnostic circles. The context usually suggests an Alexandrian or Egyptian influence.⁴⁸ Let us add that discovering a sacred text on a stele and discovering a sacred book (ἱερὰ βιβλος) are essentially variations of the same phenomenon.⁴⁹

plethra wide. It is worth noting that there are considerable differences between Euhemerus and Plato. In the Ἱερὰ Ἀναγραφή the inscription on the stele was made by Zeus himself to immortalise his own family, whereas on Atlantis the stele was erected by the first kings to pass on the laws granted by Poseidon.

44 *Aret. Isid.* 2, p. 1 Totti τάδε ἐγράφη ἐκ τῆς στήλης τῆς ἐν Μέμφει ἥτις ἔστηκεν πρὸς τῷ Ἥφαιστῷ. See e.g. Harder, *Karpokrates* (1944), 24–25; Nock, rev. Harder [1949], reprint in *idem, Essays* (1972), II, 704, 708–709; Müller, *Ägypten* (1961), 12–13; Bergman, *Ich bin Isis* (1968), 42–43.

45 Ps.-Dositheus (=Hermeneumata Stephani), in Corp. Gloss. Lat. ed. G. Goetz, III, Leipzig 1892, 386–387. Cf. the golden stele in the temple of Hera Lacinia near Croton in Magna Graecia (Cic. De div. I 48; Liv. XXIV 3, 6).

46 Manetho (FGrHist 609 T 11 a) ap. Syncel. *Ecl. chronogr.* 72 p. 41 Mosshammer; PGM VIII 42 (Hermupolis); *Nag Ham. Cod.* VI 6, 61–62 p. 296 Robinson (Diospolis). Cf. Iambl. *De myst.* I 2 (Pythagoras and Plato had read the Hermes stele) as well as *P. Berol.* 21243, 1–5 ed. W.M. Brashear (=ZPE 33, 1979, 262). See Kroll, *Hermes Trismegistos* (1912), 794, 802; Ruska, *Tabula Smaragdina* (1926), 19–20, 35–36; Wellmann, *Marcellus von Side* (1934), 13–14; Fowden, *The Egyptian Hermes* (1993), 29–30, 35. On Egyptian steles, see Proclus, *In Plat. Tim. comment.* I 102, 20–22 Diehl. Cf. Kákosy, *Horusstele* (1980), 60–62; Kákosy, *Metternichstele* (1982), 122–124; Martin, *Stele* (1986), 1–6. Cf. prologue to *Cyranides* I (p. 14–18 Kaimakis), which speaks of a text inscribed in an iron stele.

47 Philo (FGrHist 790 F 1) ap. Eus. *Praep. ev.* I 9, 26. See Nautin, *Sanchuniathon* (1949), 264–266; Baumgarten, *The Phoenician History* (1981), 77–82; Baumgarten, *Heiliges Wort* (1998), 193. I am less convinced by the interpretation that this was Ammonite script (Ἀμμουνέων γράμματα) and not the temple of Ammon (ἀπὸ τῶν ἁδούτων ... Ἀμμουνείων) as suggested by West, *Orpheus, Sanchuniathon* (1994), 293–294 and Doehorn, *Porphyrus* (2002), 137–138 with n. 39.

48 See Henrichs, *The Sophists and Hellenistic Religion* (1984), 152, n. 57.

49 Ganszyniec, *Der Ursprung* (1923/24), 353; Speyer, *Bücherfunde* (1970), 111. A different view is held by Baumgarten, *Heiliges Wort* (1998), 205–206, n. 136. On the discovery of books and steles, see e.g. Festugière, *La révélation* (1950), I, 319–324; *idem, Lieux communs littéraires* (1960), 124–126, reprint in *idem, Études de religion* (1972), 272–274; Speyer, *Bücherfunde* (1970), 111–122.

Likewise the erection of a stele by a ruler to convey to posterity his deeds was widely practiced in ancient times.⁵⁰

The priests themselves showed Euhemerus the stele⁵¹ and presumably translated the unknown hieroglyphic text for him into Greek. Earlier Herodotus had referred to the account of Egyptian priests in his history of Egypt and according to Plato⁵² Solon had heard the story of prehistoric Athens from an Egyptian priest who referred to sacred books.⁵³

One can clearly see that Euhemerus' account of the discovery of a stele placed by a ruler inside a temple was very much in keeping with Greek tradition. This was a topos the Greek writers willingly used. Some scholars, however, saw in it an Egyptian influence. Richard Reitzenstein believed Euhemerus was inspired by an Egyptian revelation story (*Offenbarungserzählung*),⁵⁴ whereas Albert Henrichs assumed Euhemerus had in mind the steles in Isis sanctuaries.⁵⁵ The latter hypothesis is not convincing since it hardly seems likely that Isis aretalogies already existed in the 4th century BC. The oldest known text is from the turn of the 1st century BC (the aretalogy or encomium of Isis in Maroneia in Thrace).⁵⁶ That is why I believe it is difficult to speak of any concrete source Euhemerus could have referred to.

50 Hdt. II 102 – 106 (Sesostris); Hdt. IV 87. 91 (Darius); Polyb. III 56, 4 (Hannibal); Diod. I 20, 1; I 55, 7; III 74, 2; IV 18, 4; Str. XVI 4, 4 p. 769 (Sesostris); Str. XVII 1, 5 p. 790 (Sesostris); Liv. XXVIII 46, 16 (Hannibal); Polyæn. *Strateg.* VIII 26; Theo Smyrn. *Expos. rer. math.* p. 105 Hiller; Philostr. *Vita Apol.* II 43; Cosmas Ind. *Top. chr.* II 58 – 63 (SCh 141, 370 – 379 = Monumentum Adulitanum); On the inscriptions of king Antiochus I of Commagene see chapter VI 3, n. 22. See Jacoby, *Euhemerus* (1907), 963–964; O. Weinreich, rev. Peek, DLZ 51, 1930, 2028–2029; Walbank, *A Historical Commentary* (1957), I, 364–365; West, *Sesostris' Stele* (1992), 117–120; Baslez, *Écriture monumentale* (1993), 71–80; Maul, *Altorientalische Tatenberichte* (1998), 7–25; Bichler, *Barbarische Inschriften* (2007), 91–106.

51 Diod. V 46, 3 = T 35.

52 Hdt. II 99–142; Pl. *Tim.* 22 A–25 D.

53 Pl. *Tim.* 23 E ἱερὰ γράμματα.

54 Reitzenstein, *Hellenist. Wundererzählungen* (1906), 17. Several examples of *Offenbarungsgeschichte* are given by Speyer, *Bücherfunde* (1970), 112–113.

55 Henrichs, *The Sophists* (1984), 152–153. See the reservations presented by Dillery, *Hecataeus* (1998), 271, n. 66, who himself sees an Egyptian influence in Euhemerus' ἱερὰ Ἀναγραφῇ. Also see Baumgarten, *Heiliges Wort* (1998), 208 'So können wir am ehesten ab diesem Zeitpunkt (d.h. ca. 230 v. Chr.) mit der Abfassung der "Uraretalogie" rechnen'. Cf. Merkelbach, *Isis Regina* (1995), 113 (the aretalogies may have been written in the 3rd century BC) and Malaise, *Le problème de l'hellénisation d'Isis* (2000), 3 'Son archétype, provenant sans doute de Memphis, pourrait remonter au III^e s.'

56 Five other Isis aretalogies (Diod. I 27, 4, Andros, Cyme, Thessaloniki, Ios) are discussed by Grandjean, *Une nouvelle arétalogie* (1975), 8–9. The most recent edition of the aretalogies in Totti, *Ausgewählte Texte* (1985), 1–18 and 60–61 (Maroneia). On the origins of Isis aretalogies, see e.g. D. Müller, rev. Bergman, OLZ 67, 1972, 117–130; Grandjean, *op. cit.*, 12–15; Žabkar, *Hymns to Isis* (1988), 135–137; Ver-

3. The priests of Zeus Triphylus

The dynasty of priests comes from Crete, from where Zeus himself brought them over to Panchaea when he was ruler of the world. Their origins are evidenced by the many Cretan phrases that they continue to use in their language.⁵⁷ The priests live around the temple and cannot go beyond the temenos of 200 stades (c. 40 km), because then someone could kill them. This is reminiscent of the prohibitions imposed on the kings of the Mosynoeci and Sabaeans.⁵⁸ The chief task of the priests is to worship the gods. They lay offerings, sing hymns and encomia in honour of the gods, praising their great achievements and benefactions bestowed on the people.⁵⁹ Moreover, the priests play the most important role in the lives of the inhabitants, for they are entrusted with the administration of justice as well as the fair distribution of crops and livestock.⁶⁰ It seems that they took over authority only after the dynasty founded by Zeus had died out.⁶¹ Their dominant role is emphasised in the way they dress. They surpass other inhabitants by wearing mitres on their heads as well as exceptionally soft garments of linen and wool. Like women, they wear colourful sandals and gold ornaments, with the exception of earrings.⁶²

Many scholars presume that the priests of Zeus Triphylus resemble Egyptian priests.⁶³ Evidence supporting this view includes the fact that they

snell, *Inconsistencies* (1990), I, 41–44; Cf. Baumgarten, *Heiliges Wort* (1998), 196–218.

57 Diod. V 46, 3 = T 35. W. Kullmann ap. Müller, *Überlegungen* (1993), 298, n. 95 noted that Apollo had brought Cretans over to serve him in the Delphic temple (*Hymn. hom. Apoll.* 388 sqq.). That is why Honigman, *Euhemerus* (2009), 30, is wrong to write about ‘autochthonous priests’.

58 See chapter IV 2, n. 32.

59 Diod. V 46, 2 = T 35 τὰς εἰς ἀνθρώπους εὐεργεσίας.

60 Diod. V 45, 4–5 = T 35; V 42, 5 = T 33. On Panchaeian society, see chapter IV 2. Some of the definitions of priests by more recent scholars are cited above in chapter IV 2, n. 15 and 27.

61 See chapter IV 2, n. 28, where I argue against the view of Müller, *Überlegungen* (1993), 291–292, who believes that Zeus did not found a dynasty on Panchaea.

62 Diod. V 46, 2 = T 35. On the priests’ robes, see Wächter, *Reinheitsvorschriften* (1910), 18–20; Stengel, *Die griechischen Kultusaltertümer* (1920), 47; Zumschlange, *Euhemerus* (1976), 39 – 43. van Gils, *Quaestiones* (1902), 25, n. 1, believed that Euhemerus took these ideas from Xen. *Anab.* I 5, 8, whereas van der Meer, *Euhemerus* (1949), 41, n. 4, assumed that the description of the priests’ attire was taken from Herodotus (III 20, IX 80). One should add that also other inhabitants of the island, not only women but also men, wore soft robes and gold adornments such as necklaces, bracelets and earrings (V 45, 6 = T 35).

63 Reitzenstein, *Zwei religionsgeschichtliche Fragen* (1901), 89–91; Jacoby, *Euhemerus* (1907), 960–961; Fraser, *Ptol. Alexandria* (1972), I, 290; Henrichs, *The Sophists* (1984), 153, n. 59 (esp. priests of the Isis and Sarapis cult); Nilsson, *Geschichte* (1988), II, 287; Dillery, *Hecataeus* (1998), 271.

live in sanctuaries, serve gods and wear garments of linen and wool. These similarities, however, are very superficial and the social position of Egyptian priests was quite different to that of the priests on Panchaea.⁶⁴ A hypothesis that Euhemerus had in mind Indian Brahmins is even less probable.⁶⁵

4. Summary

On the island of Panchaea there is supposed to be a temple built by Zeus when as a human being he ruled the entire world. Although some elements of this edifice (massive columns and a dromos) resemble ancient Egyptian and Doric temples, I believe the Zeus Triphylus sanctuary is Euhemerus' original invention. The description of the temenos resembles the descriptions of nature on other utopian islands, e.g. Plato's Atlantis and Hecataeus of Abdera's Helixioia, but that does not mean Euhemerus necessarily relied on these particular authors because many writers, from the poetry of Homer to the time of the Roman Empire, used the *locus amoenus* literary convention.

On the golden stele there was an inscription in Panchaeian writing, which resembled Egyptian hieroglyphs. Zeus had inscribed on it the deeds of Uranus, Cronus and his own, whereas Hermes later added what was achieved during reigns of Artemis and Apollo. It seems that the deeds of these rulers constituted the main part of the Ἱερὰ Ἀναγραφή. Euhemerus' description of the stele is well rooted in Greek tradition because Herodotus and Plato also wrote about steles in temples. That is why there is no reason to search for any Egyptian influences in Euhemerus' work. The theme of discovering a stele or book was very popular in the Hellenistic period and during the Roman Empire, not only among pagans but also in Jewish and Gnostic circles.

The priests, whom none other than Zeus brought over from Crete, devote most of their time to laying offerings and praising the good deeds of gods in hymns and encomia. But they also have political authority, because they are entrusted with the administration of justice as well as the distribution of crops and livestock. Similarities with Egyptian priests are very superficial and their position in Panchaeian society is quite different to that of priests in Egypt.

64 On Egyptian priests, see e.g. Otto, *Priester und Tempel* (1908), II, esp. 167–260; Bonnet, *Reallexikon* (1952), 596–607 (s. v. Priester); Kees, *Das Priestertum* (1953–1958); San Nicolò, *Ägyptische Vereinswesen* (1972), 57 ff., 67 ff.; Helck *Wirtschaftsgeschichte* (1975), index s.v. Priesterdienst and Priesterstellen; Sauneron, *Les prêtres* (1988), esp. 81–118.

65 Rohde, *Der gr. Roman* (1914), 240, n. 0; Finley, *Utopianism* (1967), 9 (Euhemerus 'borrowed the idea of a priestly caste from India'). This view was rightly rejected by Bichler, *Zur histor. Beurteilung* (1984), 193, n. 40.

VI. An attempt to interpret the Ἱερὰ Ἀναγραφὴ

1. Destruction of belief in the Olympian gods

The doxographical tradition ignored the literary character of Euhemerus' work, reducing it to the thesis that the gods were deified people. That is why Euhemerus was deemed to be impious and was entered in the catalogue of atheists.¹ Let us add that the author of the Ἱερὰ Ἀναγραφὴ was most probably not even a philosopher but only a philosophising writer. Either way it is certainly not true that he belonged to the Cyrenaic or Peripatetic school.² Also some modern scholars believed that Euhemerus was an atheist,³ his work was intended to destroy belief in the Olympian gods.⁴ P.M. Fraser stated that it is hard to believe the author of the *Sacred History* did not realise the book would be used by opponents of traditional beliefs.⁵

Extant testimonia, however, do not entitle us to make such a judgement. Firstly, the attempt to show the origins of religion was by no means original because Euhemerus was referring to a debate run at the time of the Sophists (see the theories of Prodicus of Ceos, Critias of Athens and Democritus

-
- 1 On catalogues of atheists, see Winiarczyk, *Der erste Atheistenkatalog* (1976), 32–46; Runia, *Atheists in Aëtius* (1996), 542–576.
 - 2 A view held by Ganß, *Quaestiones Euhemereae* (1860), 17; Kan, *Disputatio* (1862), 32; Mullach, *Fragmenta* (1867), II, 431–432; Zieliński, *Hermes* (1906), 51; Zeller, *Die Philosophie* (1922), II 1, 342–343. The opinion that Euhemerus belonged to the Cyrenaic school was criticised by: de Block, *Évhémère* (1876), 138–141; Némethy, *Euhemeri reliquiae* (1889), 6; van Gils, *Quaestiones* (1902), 103–104; Jacoby, *Euemerios* (1907), 968; Rohde, *Der gr. Roman* (1914), 241, n. 1; Joël, *Geschichte* (1921), 948, n. 2; Winiarczyk, *Theodoros* (1981), 92. With regard to Euhemerus supposedly being a Peripatetic, see chapter I 1, with n. 9, 11 and 12.
 - 3 Sussemihl, *Geschichte* (1891), I, 322 'ein unbedingter Atheist'; Pöhlmann, *Geschichte* (1925), II, 295; Langer, *Euhemerios* (1926), 59; Nilsson, *Geschichte* (1988), II, 288. One should add that the words 'atheism' and 'atheist' have many meanings and scholars have used them in various ways, which has often led to misunderstandings. See Winiarczyk *Methodisches* (1990), 1–15; *idem*, *Antike Bezeichnungen* (1992), 216–225. Cf. Meijer, *Philosophers* (1981), 216–232; Bremmer, *Atheism* (2007), 11–26.
 - 4 Nestle, *Vom Mythos zum Logos* (1942), 546 'ein leicht verschleierter Atheismus'; Helm, *Der antike Roman* (1956), 26; Gigon, *Die antike Kultur* (1971), 84 'Destruktion der klassischen Götterwelt'. Cf. Stern, *Rationalizing Myth* (1999), 219 'The euhemeristic tradition is essentially atheistic and aims to create disbelief.'
 - 5 Fraser, *Ptol. Alexandria* (1972), I, 294.

of Abdera).⁶ Secondly, Euhemerus clearly wrote about two types of deity:⁷ a) eternal and immortal gods, i.e. the sun, the moon and stars, and b) earthly gods, i.e. deified people. His work only concerns the latter category. Although some scholars have questioned Diodorus Siculus' account of the *theologia dipertita*, I have tried to prove that such criticism is unjustified.⁸ If we accept that Diodorus faithfully presented Euhemerus' theological views, we cannot call the author of the ἱερὰ Ἀναγραφὴ an atheist or his book atheistic.⁹

2. Satire on the ruler cult

Towards the end of the 19th century several scholars considered Euhemerus' novel to be a satire on the ruler cult that became widespread after the death of Alexander the Great.¹⁰ Rudolf Hirzel (1846–1917) believed that Euhemerus was really at the court of Cassander of Macedonia and that is why he wrote a satire on the ruler cult of the Ptolemies.¹¹ The satirical nature of the work was supposed to be apparent in the presentation of Cadmus as the cook of the king of Sidon and Harmonia as a flute-girl.¹² However, Felix Jacoby¹³ rejected this interpretation, arguing that when the book was being written (c. 280 BC, according to Jacoby), the Diadochi had not yet aspired to self-deification. Moreover, it was not regarded as a satirical work in ancient

6 Prodicus (DK 84 B 5) ap. Cic. *Nat. deor.* I 118; Philod. *P. Herc* 1428, col. II 28–III 13 (ed. A. Henrichs, *CrErc* 4, 1974, 13–14 = *De piet.* p. 75–76 Gomperz = p. 117 Schober); Min. Fel. *Oct.* 21, 2; Sext. Emp. *Adv. math.* IX 18.52. Critias (DK 88 B 25 = TrGF 43 F 19) ap. Sext. Emp. *Adv. math.* IX 54; cf. Aëtius, *Plac.* I 7, 2 p. 298 Diels. Democritus: a) DK 68 B 30 ap. Cl. Al. *Protr.* VI 68, 5; cf. DK 68 A 75 ap. Sext. Emp. *Adv. math.* IX 24; b) DK 68 B 166 ap. Sext. Emp. *Adv. math.* IX 19. Extensive literature is listed by Winiarczyk, *Bibliographie* (1994), 32–34 (Democritus), 73–77 (Critias), 81–83 (Prodicus).

7 Diod. VI 1,1 (T 25).

8 See chapter III 1.

9 Dochhorn, *Ein 'Inscripfenfund'* (2000), 270–271 and Garstad, *Belus* (2004), 257, also do not believe that Euhemerus was an atheist. Goulet, *Évhémère* (2000), 410, on the other hand, does.

10 Gruppe, *Griechische Culte* (1887), 17 'äussert sich nicht in der Form der derben Satire, sondern als feine Ironie'; Gruppe, *Griechische Mythologie* (1906), I, 10, II, 1515 'Als Satire ist vielleicht auch die ἱερὰ ἀναγραφὴ des Euhemerus aufzufassen'; Ribbeck, *Geschichte* (1894), I, 46; Hirzel, *Der Dialog* (1895), 394–396; Schwartz, *Fünf Vorträge* (1943), 116 'ein witziger Hieb gegen Thron und Altar'.

11 Salin, *Platon* (1921), 279, n. 5, also attributed to the ἱερὰ Ἀναγραφὴ an anti-Egyptian character.

12 Athen. XIV 77, 658 EF = T 77.

13 Jacoby, *Euhemerus* (1907), 967. O. Gruppe's view had previously been rejected by Ziehen, *Zur Geschichte* (1890), 436; van Gils, *Quaestiones* (1902), 60; Rohde, *Der gr. Roman* (1914), 237, n. 1.

times. R. Hirzel's hypothesis was convincingly criticised by Julius Kaerst (1857–1930),¹⁴ who rightly doubted Alexandrian court theology (*alexandrinische Hoftheologie*) was sufficiently developed in Euhemerus' lifetime (i.e. the first quarter of the 3rd century BC). Although he conceded that the work may have included satirical elements, perhaps even ones targeting the Ptolemaic court, he believed its purpose was not so much polemical satire as a didactic work, for the author wanted to convince the reader that deified people deserved a cult. More recently Niklas Holzberg¹⁵ wondered whether Euhemerus had written a more or less disguised satire on deification and the ruler cult but eventually conceded that the interpretation of mythology played a very important role in the *Ἱερὰ Ἀναγραφή*.

3. A justification or promotion of the ruler cult

a. Many scholars suppose that Euhemerus wanted to explain and justify the ruler cult.¹⁶ Since powerful rulers in primeval times attained divine honours for the benefits they bestowed on their subjects,¹⁷ so too should Greeks of the Hellenistic period worship their kings as gods. Zeus would therefore be the inventor (*πρῶτος εὐρετής*) of the ruler cult. Scholars have also wondered whether or not the *Ἱερὰ Ἀναγραφή* inclined Ptolemy II Philadelphus to proclaim the *θεοὶ ἀδελφοί* cult in 272/271.¹⁸ Conversely, other scholars

14 Kaerst, *Geschichte* (1926), II, 190–193, esp. 192, n. 3. R. Hirzel's hypothesis was later criticised by van der Meer, *Euhemerus* (1949), 119–121.

15 Holzberg, *Novel-like Works* (2003), 625. Cf. Stephens, *Seeing Double* (2003), 38, n. 55 'It may have been intended ironically or as a parody, or, more likely, it was a utopian fantasy with serious philosophical intent'.

16 Wellmann, *Aegyptisches* (1896), 232; Kaerst, *Geschichte* (1926), II, 190–193; Aalders, *Political Thought* (1975), 66; Meillier, *Callimaque* (1979), 203.

17 See Euhem. T 35 (Diod. V 46, 2) the priests praise *τὰς εἰς ἀνθρώπους εὐεργεσίας* (scil. τῶν θεῶν); T 49 (Diod. VI 1, 8) *ἐπεικὴ τινα ἄνδρα καὶ εὐεργετικόν* (scil. Οὐρανόν); T 66 (Lact. *Div. inst.* I 13, 2) 'primum Iovem leges hominibus moresque condentem edicto prohibuisse, ne liceret eo cibo (scil. humano corpore) vesci'; T 69 A (Lact. *Div. inst.* I 11, 45) 'reliquitque (scil. Iuppiter) hominibus leges mores frumentaue paravit multaue alia bona fecit'; cf. T 69 B (Lact. *Epit. div. inst.* 13, 4–5). That is why I believe Müller, *Überlegungen* (1993), 281–282, is wrong to argue that the basis for deification in the *Ἱερὰ Ἀναγραφή* was above all political power and not euergetism. Müller refers to T 14 (Cic. *Nat. deor.* I 119 'fortis aut claros aut potentis vires') as well as T 67 (Lact. *Div. inst.* I 11, 35 'item si quis quid novi invenerat quid ad vitam humanam utile esset, eo veniebant atque Iovi ostendebant'). However, he ignores the above cited testimonia when they clearly state that Euhemerus presented Zeus not only as a powerful ruler but as a benefactor to humanity.

18 Fraser, *Ptol. Alexandria* (1972), I, 294; Kokolakis, *Zeus' Tomb* (1995), 130. On the dating of the *θεοὶ ἀδελφοί* cult, see chapter III 2 F b (n. 226).

maintain it was the royal decision that influenced Euhemerus' work.¹⁹ This problem cannot be resolved since we do not know exactly when the Ἱερὰ Ἀναγραφὴ was written. In my opinion it is more probable that the self-deification was of the king's own initiative and not inspired by any literary work. Recently R.J. Müller²⁰ expressed the view that Euhemerus' work contained only a sober analysis of relations in early Hellenism and did not promote the ruler cult, but this view is difficult to justify.

b. According to Heinrich Dörrie (1911–1983),²¹ Euhemerus not only wished to justify the ruler cult but also to present contemporary monarchs with an example of how they could become gods. This was to be a sort of looking glass for rulers (*Fürstenspiegel*). H. Dörrie was convinced that it was in this way that the Ἱερὰ Ἀναγραφὴ was interpreted by the advisers of Antiochus I, the king of Commagene in Asia Minor who created his own cult in the 1st century BC.²² This view has been rightly rejected by some scholars.²³ Towards the end of the Hellenistic period the ruler cult phenomenon was so well known that there was no need to refer to a literary source to promote the divinity of Antiochus.

c. P.J.M. van Gils²⁴ holds a unique stance according to which Euhemerus wrote the Ἱερὰ Ἀναγραφὴ to prepare the way for the deification of Cassander in reference to the personality and achievements of Alexander the Great.

19 Otto, *Priester* (1908), II, 274, n. 2; Buffière, *Les mythes* (1956), 245; Müller, *Überlegungen* (1993), 279, n. 11.

20 Müller, *op.cit.*, 281. Koch, *Zur Utopie* (1979), 407, presumes that Euhemerus did not intend to give 'die ideologische Stützung eines hellenistischen Königshauses' (i.e. Antiochus of Commagene) but nevertheless did have some influence.

21 Dörrie, *Der Königskult* (1964), 218–224; *idem*, *Euhemerios* (1967), 415; *idem*, *Das gute Beispiel* (1978), 245–262. This hypothesis was accepted by Aalders, *Political Thought* (1975), 66; Ebach, *Euhemerismus* (1990), 366; Merkelbach, *Mithras* (1994), 69–70; Colpe, *Utopie* (1995), 39; Meister, *La storiografia* (2006), 165. See the point of view of Koch cited in n. 20.

22 On Antiochus I see e.g. Wagner, *Dynastie und Herrscherkult* (1983), 177–224; Jacobs, *Das Heiligtum* (2000), 27–35; *idem*, *Die Religionspolitik* (2000), 45–49; Wagner, *Die Könige von Kommagene* (2000), 11–25; Edelmann, *Religiöse Herrschaftslegitimation* (2007), 308–322. Inscriptions were published by Dörrie, *Der Königskult* (1964), 29–131; Waldmann, *Die kommagenischen Kultreformen* (1973), 5–141; Wagner, Petzl, *Eine neue Temenos-Stele* (1976), 213–214; Crowther, Facella, *New Evidence for the Ruler Cult* (2003), 41–80; Wagner, Petzl, *Relief-und Inschriftfragmente* (2003), 85–96.

23 O. Murray, CR 16, 1966, 108; P. Pédech, REA 68, 1966, 436–437; H.W. Pleket, 'Mnemosyne' 21, 1968, 444–447; Price, *Rituals and Power* (1984), 38; Waldmann, *Der Kommagenische Mazdaismus* (1991), 38, n. 81.

24 van Gils, *Quaestiones* (1902), 50–57.

This hypothesis has been rightly criticised²⁵ but one has to concede that the figure of Alexander must have had some influence on how the achievements of Zeus were presented in Euhemerus' work.²⁶

4. A description of an ideal state system

The inhabitants of Panchaea comprise three social groups, of which that of the priests have the leading political role. There is a collective economy because the farmers and shepherds submit their crops and reared livestock to be distributed among the entire population by the priests. The inhabitants have no private property, with the exception of the shepherds and farmers, who have their own houses and gardens.²⁷ That is why many scholars believed the author of the *Ἱερὰ Ἀναγραφὴ* was presenting an ideal state system.²⁸ Some even supposed that Euhemerus believed such a political ideal could be realised.²⁹ This would therefore be a *Fürstenspiegel* of sorts, showing rulers which socio-political system was the best. H. Braunert³⁰ believed that Panchaea had a constitution that included monarchical, aristocratic and democratic elements, the purpose of which was to maintain a balance between the polis and the monarchy as well as to ensure rights of each social group were respected. This would be a specific type of mixed constitution (*constitutio mixta*), which had already been discussed by Aristotle in book IV of *Politics*, and later by Polybius in book VI of *Histories*.³¹ H. Braunert's hypothesis was analysed in detail and correctly rejected by M. Zumschlinge.³²

25 J. Tolkiehn, WKIPh 20, 1903, 541; Jacoby, *Euemerios* (1907), 967; Kaerst, *Geschichte* (1926), II, 182, n. 0; van der Meer, *Euhemerus* (1949), 119.

26 Thus e.g. Jacoby, *op. cit.*, 967; Kaerst, *op. cit.*, 183; Kern, *Die Religion* (1938), III, 123; Schwartz, *Fünf Voträge* (1943), 115–116; Helm, *Der antike Roman* (1956), 26; Nilsson, *Geschichte* (1988), II, 287.

27 Diod. V 45, 2–46, 4 = T 35. See chapter IV 2.

28 See chapter IV 2, n. 21.

29 Susemihl, *Geschichte* (1891), I, 318; Pöhlmann, *op.cit.*, 302–303, 'Euhemerios wenigstens gewisse Grundprinzipien seines Sozialstaates Panchäa ebenso für realisierbar halten konnte.'

30 Braunert, *Staatstheorie* (1968), 54–66.

31 See e.g. von Fritz, *The Theory of the Mixed Constitution* (1954), 45 ff., 81 ff.; Aalders, *Die Mischverfassung* (1965), 199–237; Aalders, *Theorie der gemischten Verfassung* (1968), esp. 54–69; Braun, *Die Theorie der Mischverfassung* (1967), 78–89; Walbank, *Polybios* (1972), 131–137; Nippel, *Mischverfassungstheorie* (1980), esp. 10–158; Schubert, *Mischverfassung* (1995), 225–235; Lintott, *The Theory of the Mixed Constitution* (1997), 70–85; Alonso-Núñez, *The Mixed Constitution in Polybios* (1999), 11–19; Hahm, *The Mixed Constitution* (2009), 178–198.

32 Zumschlinge, *Euhemerios* (1976), 114–179, 233–238. See chapter IV 3. Braunert's theory was also rejected by Aalders, *Political Thought* (1975), 68, and Müller, *Überlegungen* (1993), 292, 299–300. Bichler, *Zur histor. Beurteilung* (1984), 204, be-

I believe Braunert's theory may be disproved in yet another way. The inhabitants of the Panchaeian city of Panara are αὐτόνομοι καὶ ἀβασίλευτοι.³³ According to this German scholar, the term ἀβασίλευτος suggests that the remaining inhabitants of Panchaea were royal subjects.³⁴ That is why he accused Diodorus from making a mistake in his summary of Euhemerus' work and erroneously stating that there was a king on Hieria but not on Panchaea. Braunert, however, has ignored the fact that this adjective also means 'subject to no authority'. I believe the expression αὐτόνομοι καὶ ἀβασίλευτοι is a typical *hendiadys* which simply emphasises the independence of the inhabitants of Panara but says nothing about the remaining inhabitants of Panchaea being ruled by a king.³⁵

We should also note that Panchaeian society is hardly ideal since crimes are committed and sometimes it is even necessary to pass death sentences.³⁶ Moreover, the state is threatened by robbers who inhabit a certain part of the island.³⁷ Euhemerus presented an archaic society that was self-sufficient and had no contacts with the outside world so that the reader would more easily accept the existence of a stele recording the history of the first rulers of Panchaea.³⁸ The purpose of the description was certainly not to present an ideal state constitution.

5. An explanation of the origins of belief in gods

F. Jacoby³⁹ was probably the first to posit that Euhemerus wanted to explain how people began believing in gods in keeping with a tradition of the Sophistic movement. Other scholars have also stressed that the main part of the Ἰερὰ Ἀναγραφή concerned deeds of Panchaea's first rulers and their deifications, whereas the description of the island merely served as background information (*Rahmenerzählung*).⁴⁰ Indeed, this interpretation is even suggested in the book's very title. Supporters of this hypothesis, however, do

lieves 'In der "Heiligen Urkunde" dagegen lassen sich politische Ziele des Verfassers kaum mehr greifen.'

33 Diod. V 42, 5 = T 33.

34 Braunert, *Die heilige Insel* (1965), 258. Braunert is also wrong to think Panchaea and Hieria are one and the same island. Although some scholars agree with him, others have correctly rejected this interpretation. See chapter IV 3.

35 See chapter IV 3.

36 Diod. V 42, 5 = T 33.

37 Diod. V 46, 1 = T 35.

38 As correctly stated by Müller, *Überlegungen* (1993), 299.

39 Jacoby, *Euemeros* (1907), 967–968. Similarly M. Gelzer, HZ 113, 1914, 105.

40 Ferguson, *Utopias* (1975), 104; Zumschlinge, *Euhemeros* (1976), 238–240; Bichler, *Zur histor. Beurteilung* (1984), 187; Müller, *Überlegungen* (1993), 299–300; Baumgarten, *Heiliges Wort* (1998), 191–192; Holzberg, *Novel-like Works* (2003), 625.

not explain why the author chose such a topic and what was the purpose of the book. In my opinion, Euhemerus decided to write such a book because he saw that various forms of ruler cult were becoming increasingly popular in Hellenistic states.

In the *Ἐπεὶ Ἀναγραφή* there is a phrase that is reminiscent of Critias' satyr play *Σίσυφος*.⁴¹ J. Kaerst⁴² came to the conclusion that Euhemerus was referring to this author's theory, according to which gods were of human invention and the purpose of belief in gods was to prevent people from doing wrong. Religion therefore served the useful function of helping to maintain social order.⁴³ It seems to me that Kaerst goes too far. Euhemerus no doubt wrote about the creation of the first state and culture in accordance with the known Sophistic concept of humans initially living in disorder, like animals.⁴⁴ That is why he used a known expression which appears in various forms in the writings of other ancient authors,⁴⁵ and he certainly did not have to be a supporter of the so-called Critias theory.

6. Promoting the idea of unity and brotherhood of all people

W.W. Tarn⁴⁶ held the view that Euhemerus was promoting Alexander the Great's idea of unity and brotherhood of all peoples, who together would form one great nation. Uranus was the first ruler to realise this concept. Similar views were espoused by Theophrastus and Alexarchus, who founded the city of Uranopolis on the Athos peninsula.⁴⁷ This theory was rightly criti-

41 Euhem. T 27 = Critias, DK 88 B 25, 1 = Critias, TrGF 43 F 19, 1 ap. Sext. Emp. *Adv. math.* IX 17 'ὅτ' ἦν ἄτακτος ἀνθρώπων βίος'. The first to note this was Hirzel, *Der Dialog* (1895), I, 397, n. 1. Dihle, *Das Satyrspiel 'Sisyphos'* (1977), 28–42, was the first to question Critias' authorship, attributing the drama to Euripides. The matter of authorship is discussed in chapter III 2 D, n. 135.

42 Kaerst, *Geschichte* (1926), II, 191, n. 2.

43 On the so-called Critias theory, see literature cited in Winiarczyk, *Bibliographie* (1994), 73–77.

44 On the emergence of culture according to Sophistic thought, see e.g. Guthrie, *In the Beginning* (1957); Spoerri, *Späthellenistische Berichte* (1959), esp. 132–163; Gatz, *Weltalter* (1967), 144–165; Guthrie, *The Sophists* (1971), esp. 55 ff.; Dierauer, *Tier und Mensch* (1977), 25–39; Kerferd, *The Sophistic Movement* (1981), esp. 83–130; Cole, *Democritus* (1990); Meier, *Ein antiker Äquivalent des Fortschrittsgedankens* (1995), 435–499; Winton, *Herodotus, Thucydides and the Sophists* (2000), 89–121, esp. 89–101; Müller, *Die Entdeckung der Kultur* (2003), esp. 68–108; Utzinger, *Periphrades Aner* (2003), 97–229.

45 Democritus (DK 68 B 5) ap. Diod. I 8,1 'ἐν ἀτάκτῳ καὶ θηριώδει βίῳ'; Ps.-Demosth. *Or.* 25, 15; Sext. Emp. *Adv. math.* IX 15. See Norden, *Agnostos Theos* (1913), 370–371, 375, 399; Heinimann, *Nomos und Physis* (1945), 9, 149–150.

46 Tarn, *Alexander* (1933), 24–25, 46; Tarn, *Alexander* (1948), II, 426–433.

47 See Winiarczyk, *Die hellenist. Utopien* (2011), 205–218.

cised by H.F. van der Meer.⁴⁸ In the Ἰερὰ Ἀναγραφή there is no mention of the unity of nations and during the reign of Uranus diverse peoples inhabited Panchaea. Moreover, the Doians were later expelled from the island by Ammon.⁴⁹ Let it be added that we cannot even prove Alexander ever really promoted the idea of a universal brotherhood of nations.⁵⁰

7. Reinterpretation of Greek mythology

Albert I. Baumgarten has recently posited that Euhemerus proposed a reinterpretation of Greek mythology which was to compete with the allegorical and physiological interpretations.⁵¹ The objective was to attribute to deified humans all the blameworthy myths while the only real gods would be the eternal, heavenly deities. Thus Euhemerus maintained the presence of real gods but freed them from immoral myths.

To me Baumgarten's interpretation does not seem very convincing for several reasons. Firstly, it quite ignores the literary character of Euhemerus' work. This was not a treatise but a novel which already in ancient times was variously interpreted. Secondly, Baumgarten does not distinguish between the views of Euhemerus and those of later Euhemerists.⁵² He does not take into account euergetism, which was one of the sources for Euhemerus, Stoicism and the ruler cult.⁵³ Thirdly, already Plato (427–347) realised that Sophistic theories on the origins of religion (including those of Prodicus and Critias) undermine belief in gods and lead to atheism.⁵⁴ That is why he presented new proof for the existence of the gods in book X of the *Laws* indicating that immortals and self-moving souls are the source of all other

48 van der Meer, *Euhemerus* (1949), 78–79, 121.

49 Diod. V 44, 6 = T 34.

50 Although Tarn's hypothesis was accepted by some scholars, e.g. Festugière, *La révélation* (1950), 192, and Stier, *Alexander* (1950), 263–264, most have rightly rejected it, e.g. Badian, *Alexander* (1958), 425–444; Baldry, *The Unity of Mankind* (1965), 113–127; Stern, *Aristotle on the World-State* (1968), 41; Schachermeyr, *Alexander* (1973), 621–623, 634–635; Bengtson, *Griechische Geschichte* (1977), 361; Bosworth, *Alexander* (1996), 4 with n. 9.

51 Baumgarten, *Euhemerus' Eternal Gods* (1996), 91–103. Similarly Honigman, *Euhemerus* (2009), 28–29, but she did not address my arguments in *Euhemerism* (2002), 116–117, which criticised Baumgarten's theory. It is worth mentioning that earlier Gale, *Myth and Poetry* (1994), 75–76 came to the same conclusion. She is of the opinion that 'this belief in 'terrestrial' gods seems to have constituted a means of bridging the widening gap between traditional mythology and philosophical theology' (p. 75).

52 See Thraede, *Euhemerismus* (1966), 881–882; Wifstrand Schiebe, *Vergil* (1997), 78–79.

53 See chapter VIII I A–B, D.

54 Pl. *Leg.* X 889 E–890 A. See Winiarczyk, *Methodisches* (1990), 6–7.

motion.⁵⁵ Likewise Epicurus (341–271), a contemporary of Euhemerus, criticised the Sophists for presuming religion to be of human origin and considered them impious.⁵⁶ The Stoic Persaeus of Citium (c. 305–243) referred to Prodicus, and not to Euhemerus, when he wanted to explain how belief in gods began.⁵⁷ In such an intellectual climate it is highly unlikely that Euhemerus would expect a positive reception for reducing the Olympian gods to deified humans. Besides, already in the first half of the 3rd century BC this view was attacked by Callimachus of Cyrene,⁵⁸ and Euhemerus found himself in the catalogue of atheists compiled by Clitomachus of Carthage, the scholarch of the Academy in the years 127/126–110/109.⁵⁹ Fourthly, Plato and Aristotle had already popularised the notion that heavenly bodies were deities and that is why if Euhemerus stated such a thing, he would be saying nothing new.⁶⁰

Jan Dochhorn defends Euhemerus against accusations of atheism and maintains that he had a positive attitude to religion. The *Ἱερὰ Αναγραφή* was to strengthen belief in gods thanks to a new interpretation of traditional myths.⁶¹ Yet this hypothesis is not supported by ancient testimonia. Dochhorn himself admits that a new interpretation of myths calls to mind the religious policies of Hellenistic rulers. In my opinion, this suggests that Euhemerus was more interested in explaining the ruler cult or its origins.

Benjamin Garstad is also of the opinion that Euhemerus created new myths to defend religion and promote a traditional cult. The *Ἱερὰ Αναγραφή* was to encourage a worldwide syncretism of Zeus as well as a cult various Zeuses with local additional names. Garstad, however, does not rule out that Euhemerus only wanted to explain the phenomenon of syncretism, which had been developing for centuries.⁶²

55 Pl. *Leg.* X 891 B–899 D; *Phaedr.* 245 C–246 A. See Horn, *Gottesbeweis* (1981), 953–954.

56 Epicurus, *Περὶ φύσεως* XII (fr. 87 Usener, fr. 27, 2 Arrighetti²) ap. Philod. *De piet.* I 19, 523–536 Obbink. See Winiarczyk, *Nochmals das Satyrspiel* (1987), 36–37, 44–45; Obbink, *Philodemus* (1996), 350–359.

57 Persaeus (SVF I 448) ap. Cic. *Nat. deor.* I 38 et Philod. *P. Herc.* 1428, col. II 28–III 13 (ed. A. Henrichs, *CrErc* 4, 1974, 13–14 = *De piet.* p. 75–76 Gomperz = p. 117 Schober); Min. Fel. *Oct.* 21, 2. See chapter VIII 1 D.

58 Callim. *Iamb.* 1, 9–11 = Euhem. T 1 A.

59 See chapter I 4 C.

60 Nilsson, *The Origin of Belief* (1940), 1–8, reprint in *idem, Opuscula* (1960), III, 31–39; Festugière, *Épicure* (1946), 102–131, esp. 102–110. See Arist. *De caelo* I 9, 279 a ff.; II 3, 286 a 9; *Met.* XII 1074 a 30–31. Cf. Ps.-Pl. *Epinomis* 981 E, 983 E, 984 D.

61 Dochhorn, *Ein 'Inscripfenfund'* (2000), 278–279, 292, 295; Dochhorn, *Zur Entstehungsgeschichte* (2001), 290.

62 Garstad, *Belus* (2004), 256–257. Cf. De Angelis, Garstad, *Euhemerus* (2005), 230–236 ('Syncretism in Euhemerus and Sicily').

8. Summary

I have discussed various interpretations of the Ἱερὰ Ἀναγραφή.⁶³ I reject as wrong hypotheses 1, 2, 3 c, 4, 6, 7, i.e. destruction of belief in the Olympian gods, a satire on the ruler cult, paving the way for the deification of Cas-sander, presenting an ideal state system, promoting the idea of unity and brotherhood among all people or reinterpretation of Greek mythology. On the other hand, I do believe that Euhemerus wanted to explain the origins of religion and thus engage in the discussion regarding the ruler cult at the start of the Hellenistic period. However, we cannot determine whether he merely intended to explain the origins of this cult or whether he also wanted to justify and promote it among Greeks. Euhemerus' religious views were not in any way original⁶⁴ because he was referring to: a) old Greek concepts (the apotheosis of heroes, gods founding cults and the tombs of gods), b) the idea of euergetism, c) rationalistic interpretation of myths, d) Sophistic theories regarding the origins of religion, e) the commander and ruler cults which began at the turn of the 4th century. Nevertheless, Euhemerus did combine all these issues into an interesting whole, which meant that the Ἱερὰ Ἀναγραφή influenced not only the Greeks but also, thanks to Ennius' translation, the Romans.

63 Some scholars have assumed the Ἱερὰ Ἀναγραφή had two or even three different aims. For example Helm, *Der antike Roman* (1956), 26 'eine ausgesprochen aufklärerische Tendenzschrift und soziale Utopie'; Aalders, *Political Thought* (1975), 66 'he may have intended to explain and justify the ruler cult ... have tried to give a historical interpretation of mythological data ... also wished to give expression to his ideas about an ideal human society'.

64 This was pointed out by Susemihl, *Geschichte* (1891), I, 1891, 320; Decharme, *La critique* (1904), 372–374; Wendland, *Die hellenistisch-römische Kultur* (1912), 120; Brown, *Euhemerus* (1946), 259, 264; Taeger, *Charisma* (1957), I, 396; Nils-son, *Geschichte* (1988), II, 287. On the sources of Euhemerus' religious views, see chapter III 2.

VII. Ennius' *Euhemerus sive sacra historia*

1. The history of its genesis

Many scholars believed that the translation of Euhemerus' work was an expression of Ennius' rationalism and his critical approach to belief in the gods.¹ For me, however, more likely are the opinions of other scholars who believe that Ennius translated Euhemerus to popularise among educated Romans² the view that outstanding individuals could be included among the gods in their lifetimes. Thus he wanted to prepare the way for the possible deification of Publius Cornelius Scipio Africanus (236/235–183).³

-
- 1 E.g. Müller, *Quintus Ennius* (1884), 71, 113; Ribbeck, *Geschichte* (1894), I, 46; Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, *Hellenist. Dichtung* (1924), I, 165; van Rooy, *Studies in Classical Satire* (1965), 39; Mariotti, *Ennius* (1967), 273; Novara, *Les idées romaines* (1982), I, 87. Sometimes scholars support this view by citing a fragment from Ennius' tragedy *Telamon*:

'Ego deum genus esse semper dixi et dicam caelitum,
sed eos non curare opinor, quid agat humanum genus;
nam si curent, bene bonis sit, male malis, quod nunc abest'.
(Scaen. fr. 316–318 Vahlen = fr. CXXXIV Jocelyn)

E.g. Bickel, *Lehrbuch der Geschichte* (1961), 104; Novara, *op. cit.* 88, n. 45. However, this it is a serious methodological mistake to associate what a character says in a play with the views of the author (See e.g. Winiarczyk, *Nochmals das Satyrspiel* (1987), 37–38 with n. 17; Lefkowitz, 'Impiety' and 'Atheism' in *Euripides* (1989), 73, 79. Some scholars believed that in the foreword Ennius wanted to reduce the rationalistic tone of his translation. E.g. Leo, *Geschichte* (1913), I, 202; Bignone, *Storia* (1946), I, 305.

- 2 One must remember that only very few people in those times were able to read books. This was rightly pointed out by Leo, *loc. cit.* and Latte, *Römische Religionsgeschichte* (1960), 266.
- 3 E.g. Griset, *L'evemerismo in Roma* (1959), 65–68 and F. Vian, *REA* 63, 1961, 491. This view was rejected by G. Garbarino, *Roma e la filosofia greca* (1973), II, 307, who believed Ennius was trying to justify the deification of Scipio 'in ambito pitagorico-stoico, secondo cui le anime dei grandi uomini vengono assunte in cielo dopo la morte'. Moreover, she was of the opinion that 'con l'*Euhemerus* Ennio tendesse in un certo senso sgombrare il campo dalla religione tradizionale basata sulla mitologia per sostituire ad essa un'altra religiosità che egli considerava fondata filosoficamente e che aveva (o avrebbe) espresso in altre opera.' Gabba, *P. Cornelio Scipione* (1975), 3, agreed with this point of view. On Ennius' attitude to the problem of apotheosis see Cole, *Cicero, Ennius* (2006), 531–548.

A. Scipio Africanus

We know that many of contemporaries considered Scipio to be someone quite exceptional who stood above other citizens and was especially favoured by the gods. It was said that at night he would go to the temple of Jupiter on the Capitol before making important political or private decisions. The temple sentries noticed that their fierce guard dogs never barked at Scipio.⁴ Moreover, there were widespread rumours that Scipio's mother conceived him when a giant snake appeared in her bedroom.⁵ This was to be evidence of the divine origins of Scipio and that is why his family put his *imago* in the *cella Iovis* of the Capitoline temple.⁶ Scipio became an even more legendary figure after his death and that is why not all elements of his legend may be uncritically regarded as the views of Romans in c. 200 BC.⁷ It is also probable that 'the life of Scipio Africanus was refashioned in the pattern of Alexander's life'.⁸ Nevertheless, it seems the core of the legend already existed in the first half of the 2nd century BC.⁹ Naturally, here one cannot discuss the complex issue of Scipio's legend and the reliability of its sources.¹⁰

- 4 Liv. XXVI 19, 5–6; Gell. VI 1, 6; *De vir. ill.* 49. See Aymard, *Scipio* (1953), 111–116. Haywood, *Studies on Scipio Africanus* (1933), 25–26, questioned the historicity of these visits, unlike Walbank, *The Scipionic Legend* (1967), 63, who believed they really occurred.
- 5 Liv. XXVI 19, 7; Gell. VI 1, 3; Cass. Dio XVI fr. 57, 39 (I 240 Boissvain).
- 6 Val. Max. VIII 15, 1; Appian. *Hisp.* 23. According to Meyer, *Untersuchungen* (1924), II, 434, these accounts indicate that his family and the state recognised the divine origins of Scipio. See, however, the critical comments of Haywood, *op. cit.*, 28 and G. De Sanctis, RFIC 14, 1936, 190. Cf. Walbank, *op. cit.*, 55. Galinsky, *Scipionic Themes* (1966), 224 ff., tried to prove that Plautus' comedy *Amphitruo* (staged c. 190) was an allusion to the close association between Scipio and Jupiter. Scullard, *Scipio Africanus* (1970), 22, does not rule out such a possibility, though Walbank, *op. cit.*, 58–59, decidedly rejected it, stating that it was doubtful Scipio would have been compared to Heracles in that period (cf. Cic. *De rep.* VI, fr. 6 Ziegler ap. Lact. *Div. inst.* I 18, 13; Sil. Ital. XIII, 628 ff., XV, 69 ff.). One has to concede that not all of Galinsky's interpretations are convincing, but it seems probable that this comedy dealt with contemporary issues and did include certain allusions to Scipio. See Hubaux, *Les grands mythes* (1945), 82; Seguin, *La religion de Scipion* (1974), 12.
- 7 Taylor, *The Divinity* (1931), 55; Classen, *Gottmenschentum* (1963), 319.
- 8 Weinstock, *Divus Iulius* (1971), 302. Similarly Meyer, *Untersuchungen* (1924), II, 435–438; Bengtson, *Scipio* (1943), 499–500; Seguin, *op. cit.*, 17, n. 46. One may notice the following similarities between Scipio and Alexander the Great: a) conceived by a deity in the form of a snake, b) contacts with a deity (Iuppiter – Zeus Ammon), c) the sea receding before their army (New Carthage – the coast between Phaselis and Perge in Pamphylia), d) mild treatment of the daughters of the Iberian chieftain Indibilis and the family of the Persian king Darius.
- 9 E.g. Walbank, *The Scipionic Legend* (1967), 63; Scullard, *Scipio* (1970), 22–23.
- 10 See e.g. Meyer, *Untersuchungen* (1924), II, 423–457; Schur, *Scipio* (1927), 95–104 ('Der Held und die Legende'); Haywood, *Studies* (1933), 9–29; Altheim, *Römische*

It seems probable that a key contributing factor to the legend was the capture of New Carthage in 209.¹¹ A day before the victory Scipio gave a speech to his soldiers in which he disclosed that in a dream Neptune had promised to help them take the city. The next day the waters in the lagoon bordering the city receded and Scipio's soldiers were able to attack from that side. This unexpected change in sea level was naturally construed as the promised divine assistance.¹²

It is worth noting that after the Roman victory at Baecula in 208, the Iberian commanders offered Scipio the title of king, and although the Roman general turned this offer down, he added somewhat enigmatically that he would rather be considered someone with the nature of a king.¹³ Some scholars assume that Scipio dreamed of becoming a monarch and wanted to achieve in the West what Alexander the Great had achieved in the East.¹⁴ The lack of verifying sources prohibit us from accepting such a hypothesis. We only know that Scipio was an open admirer of the Syracusan tyrants Dionysius I and Agathocles (Polyb. XV 35). It is also difficult to determine Scipio's attitude to the legend that surrounded him or even his personal religious views.¹⁵

Religionsgeschichte (1953), II, 30–36; Taeger, *Charisma* (1960), II, 27–31; Classen, *Gottmenschen* (1963), 315–321; Walbank, *The Scipionic legend* (1967), 54–69; Scullard, *Scipio* (1970), 18–23, 246–248.

- 11 E.g. Schur, *op. cit.*, 29–30; Classen, *op. cit.*, 319; Walbank, *op. cit.*, 64, 68; Scullard, *op. cit.*, 19.
- 12 Polyb. X 11–14. Meyer, *op. cit.*, 438, was of the opinion that the receding sea was an invention of popular literature. However, other scholars rightly treat this event as a historical fact, though their appraisals of Polybius' account vary (e.g. Walbank, *op. cit.*, 67–68). Also see Klotz, *Studien zu Polybios* (1952), esp. 334–343 ('Die Eroberung von Neukarthago durch Scipio'). Skutsch, *Notes on Ennian Tragedy* (1966), 125–126, reprint in *idem*, *Studia Enniana* (1968), 174–175 assumed that Plautus in his comedy *Amphitruo*, 41 ff., makes an allusion to Ennius' tragedy *Andromacha* (staged in 195–191), in which there is mention of New Carthage being captured with Neptune's assistance. A similar view is held by Galinsky, *Scipionic Themes* (1966), 213. It was also regarded as probable by Scullard, *Scipio* (1970), 246, n. 5.
- 13 Polyb. X 40, 2–5; Liv. XXVII 19, 4–5 'sibi maximum nomen imperatoris esse dixit quo se milites sui appellassent; regium nomen alibi magnum, Romae intolerabile esse, si id in hominis ingenio amplissimum ducerent, tacite iudicarent, vocis usurpatione abstinere'; Cass. Dio XVI fr. 57, 48. See Aymard, *Polybe* (1954), 121–128, reprint in *idem*, *Études* (1967), 387–395; Étienne, *Le culte impérial* (1958), 88–92.
- 14 Griset, *L'évemerismo* (1959), 67–68; Seguin, *La religion* (1974), 17–18.
- 15 Conversely, Galinsky, *op. cit.*, 229–230 'apotheosis is a Greek concept, which Scipio and Ennius already have implicitly accepted and now try to make palatable to the Romans – *si fas est*' and Seguin, *op. cit.*, 12. Also see Liv. XXVI 19, 8 'his miraculis numquam ab ipso (scil. Scipione) elusa fides est; quin po-

Apotheosis was not an entirely new concept to the Roman aristocracy, some of whom had come across it during campaigns in the East. Moreover, some had actually been granted divine honours. Particularly noteworthy is the case of Scipio's contemporary, the 198 consul Titus Quinctius Flaminius, who proclaimed the freedom of the Greek poleis during the Isthmian Games of 196. That is why the Greeks greeted him with a paean as a saviour (σωτήρ),¹⁶ in Chalcis his cult was founded, for which a special priest was nominated, and in Gythion on the Peloponnese special games were held in his honour.¹⁷ Richard Mansfield Haywood considers it likely that the Greeks also deified Scipio, who had forced Antiochus III to leave Greece, but the scholar concedes that there is no recorded evidence of this.¹⁸ Here one should remember that the apotheosis of Roman commanders in the East had no significance in Rome.

B. Ennius' *Scipio*

According to the *Suda*, Ennius wrote a work glorifying Scipio,¹⁹ of which only three authentic fragments have survived.²⁰ The literary form and the message of this work are the subjects of debate. Some scholars believe it was written in polymetric verse and this is one of the reasons why they include

tius aucta arte quadam nec abnuendi tale quicquam nec palam adfirmandi'; Liv. XXXVIII 56, 11–13 'castigatum enim quondam ab eo populum ait (scil. T. Sempronius Gracchus), quod eum perpetuum consulem et dictatorem vellet facere; prohibuisse statuas sibi in comitio, in rostris, in curia, in Capitolio, in cella Iovis poni; prohibuisse ne decerneretur ut imago sua triumphali ornatu e templo Iovis optimi maximi exiret'. Most scholars consider this testimony to be a later forgery, but not Haywood, *Studies* (1933), 16–18, and Weinstock, *Divus Iulius* (1971), 36.

16 Plut. *Flam.* 10, 7.

17 Plut. *Flam.* 16, 5–7. See Taeger, *Charisma* (1960), II, 40, n. 46; Gundel, *Quinctius* (1963), 1075–1076; Weinstock, *op. cit.*, 289 with n. 2; Gruen, *The Hellenistic World* (1984), I, 329–330.

18 Haywood, *op. cit.*, 15.

19 *Suda* s.v. Ἐννίος (II 285 Adler) Σκιπίωνα γὰρ ἄδων καὶ ἐπὶ μέγα τὸν ἄνδρα ἐξῆραι βουλόμενός φησι μόνον ἂν Ὅμηρον ἐπαξιούς ἐπαίνους εἰπεῖν Σκιπίωνος. Scholz, *Der 'Scipio'* (1984), 184–185, rightly criticised the editors of Ennius' works who had attributed all fragments mentioning Scipio to Ennius' *Scipio*. Some even included the well-known distich 'Si fas endo plagas caelestium ascendere cuiquam est// mi soli caeli maximi porta patet' (Epigr. fr. 4 Vahlen), believing it to be the end of Ennius' work (fr. 13 Pascal, fr. 16 Bolisani).

20 Fr. 6–8 = *Varia* 9–14 Vahlen. New editions: Courtney, *The Fragmentary Latin Poets* (2003), 26–30 (fr. 29–34); Russo, *Quinto Ennio* (2007), 187–189 (test. I–II, fr. I–IV); Blänsdorf, *Fragmenta* (2011), 81–82 (fr. 29–34).

it in book III of the *Saturae*.²¹ Others rightly consider the *Scipio* to be an independent work.²²

Udo W. Scholz tried to prove that the *Scipio* was Ennius' literary form of gratitude to his protector, who had instructed Cato to take him from Sardinia.²³ The piece was to allude to a triumphal song of Roman soldiers composed in trochees. A more likely interpretation, accepted by several other scholars, was put forward by Anton Elter (1858–1925), according to which Ennius was attempting to deify Scipio.²⁴

-
- 21 Lersch, *De Ennii Scipione* (1837), 420–421; Müller, *Quintus Ennius* (1884), 107; Pascal, *Lo Scipio di Ennio* (1915), 370–373, reprint in *idem, Scritti varii* (1920), 5–7; Schanz, Hosius, *Geschichte* (1927), 96; Bolisani, *Ennio minore* (1935), 11, 34 ff.; Richter, *Staat, Gesellschaft* (1962), 301, n. 39; Suerbaum, *Untersuchungen* (1968), 239–240 with n. 701; *idem*, *Entretiens sur l'Antiquité Classique* 17, 1972, 139. Della Corte, *Intorno alle Saturae* (1935/1936), 198–205, believed the title *Saturae* did not come from Ennius but from an author of satirical anthologies who lived some two centuries later. The polymetric character of the *Scipio* has been questioned by Scholz, *Der 'Scipio'* (1984), 185–192, who tries to show that fr. VIII is written in trochaic septenar and not hexameter. On the other hand, Skutsch, *Ennius* (1905), 2598–2599, and Puelma Piwonka, *Lucilius und Kallimachos* (1949), 189 with n. 1, considered the *Scipio* to have been an epic poem.
- 22 E.g. Petermann, *Über die Satire* (1852), 1–8; Vahlen, *Ennianae poesis reliquiae* (1903), CCXV–CCXVI; Weinreich, *Römische Satiren* (1949), XXV; Jocelyn, *The Poems of Quintus Ennius* (1972), 1022–1023; Waszink, *Problems Concerning the Satire of Ennius* (1972), 106, 128; Knoche, *Die römische Satire* (1982), 18–19, 112–113; Schoz, *Die 'Satura' des Q. Ennius* (1986), 36–37. Cf. Mariotti, *Ennius* (1967), 273; Coffey, *Roman Satire* (1976), 31; Gruen, *Studies* (1996), 109, n. 142.
- 23 Scholz, *Der 'Scipio'* (1984), 195 with n. 37. It is worth mentioning that Badian, *Ennius* (1972), 155–163, questioned Nepos' account (*Vita Cat.* 1, 4) regarding the taking of Ennius from Sardinia, but his view was rejected by other scholars, including: Astin, *Cato the Censor* (1978), 16 with n. 8; Skutsch, *The Annals* (1985), 1, n. 4; von Albrecht, *A History* (1997), I, 129, n. 1.
- 24 Elter, *Donarem pateras* (1907); Anderson, *Heracles and His Successors* (1928), 31–37; Galinsky, *Scipionic Themes* (1966), 227–228; Weinstock, *Divus Iulius* (1971), 294. Cf. Walbank, *The Scipionic Legend* (1967), 57 'Elter's theory ... deserves serious consideration'. Haywood, *Studies* (1933), 18–19, n. 39, was unconvinced by Elter's arguments but then added the 'The possibility remains, however, in spite of the strong evidence for heroization, that Ennius intended to deify him.' A different view was held by Schanz, Hosius, *Geschichte* (1927), 96 and Classen, *Romulus* (1962), 180, who wrote 'Erwägungen (scil. Elters) beruhen auf einigen interpolierten Versen bei Horaz und einer mißverstandenen Bemerkung bei Laktanz (inst. 1, 9, 1).' Classen deleted in Horace's *Carmen* IV 8 vv. 15^b–19^a, as did: Lachmann, *Horatiana* (1848), 164–166; Jachmann, *Calabrae Pierides* (1935), 331–351; Becker, *Donarem pateras* (1959), 212–222. Some editors accepted this (e.g. F. Klingner, Leipzig ³1959; D.R. Shackleton Bailey, Stuttgart 1985), but others rejected it (e.g. A. Kiessling, R. Heinze, Berlin ⁸1955; S. Borzsák, Leipzig 1984). They only delete v. 17. I nevertheless have to concede I find Elter's attempt to reconstruct Ennius' *Scipio* unconvincing.

The work was most probably written shortly after Scipio's return from Africa, i.e. in the years 200–194,²⁵ when the commander's career was at its highest (censor and princeps senatus in 199, then again consul and princeps senatus in 194). The apotheosis of the victor of Zama never occurred because Roman society was not prepared for it.²⁶

C. Dating Ennius' *Euhemerus*

If it is true that Ennius really wanted to contribute to the deification of Scipio, his translation of Euhemerus' work would have also occurred in the years 200–194, because it would have served the same purpose as his work entitled *Scipio*. One cannot rule out that Ennius worked on both works simultaneously.²⁷

2. The translation title

Lactantius gives various titles for the translation. The most common versions of the title are *Sacra historia* (T 51 B, 54, 57, 62, 64 B, 69 A) and *Historia sacra* (T 64 A, 66, 75 A; cf. T 59 *historia, quam vestri etiam sacram vocant*). However, at one point Lactantius writes *Ennius quidem in Euhemero* (T 51

25 Dating the *Scipio* – after the commander's return from Africa: Vahlen, *op. cit.*, XII; Schanz, Hosius, *op. cit.*, 91; Galinsky, *Scipionic Themes* (1966), 230; Coffey, *Roman Satire* (1976), 26; Scholz, *Die 'Satura'* (1986), 37, n. 41; after 202 and before 188: Grilli, *Studi enniani* (1965), 115–116; after 202 and before 187 (i.e. before Scipio's trial): Marastoni, *Studio critico su Ennio* (1961), 13; 'after the Antiochus campaign' (i.e. 190/189): Skutsch, *Notes* (1966), 126 = *Studia Enniana* (1968), 175; 'Scipione era ancora in vita, ma dopo i processi': Pascal, *Lo Scipio* (1915), 379; after Scipio's death (183): Müller, *Quintus Ennius* (1884), 110; Haywood, *Studies* (1933), 20; Gruen, *Studies* (1996), 109; before the *Annales*: Skutsch, *Ennius* (1905), 2599; Jocelyn, *The Poems* (1972), 996; Knoche, *Die römische Satire* (1982), 18; Skutsch, *The Annals* (1985), 3, cf. Suerbaum, *Untersuchungen* (1968), 105, n. 303. However, this is a very inaccurate definition of time since there is no consensus either as to when the *Annales* were written. On attempts to date the *Annales* see Suerbaum, *op. cit.*, 114–115; Jocelyn, *op. cit.*, 997–999; Skutsch, *The Annals*, 4–6.

26 Weinstock, *Divus Iulius* (1971), 294–295, argued that a public cult of Scipio did exist in Rome for a short while, but there is no evidence to support this.

27 Dating the *Euhemerus* – the years 204–181: Garbarino, *Roma e la filosofia* (1973), II, 304; 201–184: Novara, *Les idées* (1982), I, 90–91, 120, 160; 189–181: Bolisani, *Ennio* (1935), 25–26; before 181 (i.e. before the burning of the books of Numa): Skutsch, *The Annals* (1985), 3, 6; Suerbaum, *Q. Ennius* (2002), 131. It is worth adding that van der Meer, *Euhemerus* (1949), 75 and Vallauri, *Evemero* (1956), 8, believed that other writers had also translated Euhemerus' work into Latin, but none of the ancient sources confirm this.

A). That is why already with the first publication in 1854, Johannes Vahlen (1830–1911) decided that Ennius' translation should be entitled *Euhemerus sive Sacra historia*, and this title was accepted by most scholars.

One should also mention that Lactantius twice used the phrase *in hunc modum nobis ex sacra scriptione traditum est* (T 10, 54) and that is why some scholars assumed the real title of Ennius' translation could be *Euhemerus sive Sacra scriptio*.²⁸ This view was rightly rejected by others.²⁹

3. The translation form

In the 19th century the prevailing opinion was that Ennius had translated Euhemerus' work in verse,³⁰ and the only controversies concerned the metre.³¹ That is why some editors gave a poetic form to the twelve extant prosaic fragments from Lactantius.³² This assumption was justified with arguments that in Lactantius' prosaic text one could discern traces of verse metre. References were also made to Ennius fable about a skylark, which was cited by Aulus Gellius in prose (*Noct. Att.* II 29, 3 ff.). It was noted that in ancient literature there is no mention of Ennius writing in prose. Moreover, reference was willingly made to the testimony of Columella (T 24), who writes 'Euhemerus poeta'.³³

The hypothesis that Ennius translated Euhemerus' work in prose emerged at the start of the 20th century. Supporters of this view believed

-
- 28 Jacoby, *Euemeris* (1907), 954, 955 (However, he rejected this view in *FGrHist I A* [1923], 309); Skutsch, *Ennius* (1905), 2601; Kappelmacher, *Die Literatur* (1926), 93; Fraser, *Ptolemaic Alexandria* (1972), II, 451, n. 819. The assumption of Pasquali, *Per la delimitazione* (1909), 46, that '*Sacra scriptio* è ... una variante intenzionale di *sacra scriptura*' does not seem very likely.
- 29 Rupprecht, *IEPA ANAΓΡΑΦΗ* (1924), 350–351; Krug, *Zum Text von Ennius' Euhemerus* (1948), 58; van der Meer, *Euhemerus* (1949), 77; Vallauri, *Evemero* (1956), 9–10.
- 30 E.g. Krahner, *Grundlinien* (1837), 40; de Block, *Évhémère* (1876), 111; Müller, *Quintus Ennius* (1884), 113; Némethy, *Euhemeri reliquiae* (1889), 21; A. Breysig, *BPhW* 11, 1891, 424; Susemihl, *Geschichte* (1891), I, 318, n. 0; Vahlen, *Ennianae poesis reliquiae* (1903), CCXXIV. See n. 36 below.
- 31 Hexameter: Krahner, de Block, Némethy; trochaic tetrameter: Ten Brink (see n. 32); iambo-trochaic tetrameter: Vahlen.
- 32 H. Columna, F. Hessel, *Amstelodami* 1707, 315–326; B. Ten Brink, *Traiecti ad Rhenum* 1855, 19–26. It is worth noting that Krahner, *op. cit.*, 39–40, considered the fragments of Ennius' translation found in Lactantius to be forgeries, but their authenticity was defended, among others, by: Ganss, *Quaestiones Euhemericae* (1860), 8–11, and de Block, *Évhémère* (1876), 133–137.
- 33 Only Crusius, *Ad scriptores Latinos exegetica* (1892), 63–64, finally showed Columella's text did not support the view that Euhemerus was a poet. See chapter I 4 D.

that Lactantius' prose had distinctly archaic Latin features.³⁴ They pointed to similarities between the prose of Ennius and Cato the Elder and that of the older Annalists.³⁵ Although there were some objections,³⁶ this interpretation was generally accepted.³⁷ Moreover most scholars believed that Ennius' translation was written 'in einer gewollt naiven Prosa',³⁸ where many sentences begin with the adverbs of time: *deinde, exim, ibi, tum*. Eduard Norden (1868–1941) believed the original Greek was written in a similar style (e.g. with the repetition of *ἔπειτα, καὶ οὕτως*) and resembled Plato's Protagoras myth (*Prot.* 320 c–322 d).³⁹ Eduard Fraenkel (1888–1970), on the other hand, saw similarities between Ennius' prose and that of the early Greek authors (Acusilaus and Pherecydes of Athens) as well early Greek fables.⁴⁰ Although Norden and Fraenkel's assumptions seem probable, one has to concede that they are not confirmed in the extant fragments of Euhemerus' work. Therefore one cannot rule out the Euhemerus' style was dif-

34 Van Gils, *Quaestiones* (1902), 74–77; F. Marx, *DLZ* 24, 1903, 2747; Skutsch, *Ennius* (1905), 2600–2601; Hache, *Quaestiones archaicae* (1907), 52–60; Jacoby, *Euhemerus* (1907), 955–956; Pasquali, *Per la delimitazione* (1909), 47–49; Leo, *Geschichte* (1913), I, 202–204; Norden, *Agnostos Theos* (1913), 374–377.

35 See Hache, *loc. cit.*; Norden, *op. cit.*, 376, n. 2; Laughton, *The Prose of Ennius* (1951), 37–39.

36 Warmington, *Remains of Old Latin* (1935), I, 414–430 maintained that Ennius' translation was in poetic form because there were traces of poetic verse in Lactantius' prosaic translation. Although he knew he could not reconstruct the exact original, he converted the text into poetic form to demonstrate to the reader how it could be done. Rose, *A Handbook* (1936), 39 'it was presumably in verse'. Ogilvie, *The Library of Lactantius* (1978), 56, doubted Ennius wrote in prose. Gratwick, *Ennius* (1982), 157, however, was decidedly of the opinion that Ennius wrote 'in iambotrochaic verse'. Moreover, some scholars have argued that Lactantius' prose fragments have no features of archaic Latin, e.g. Schanz, *Römische Literaturgeschichte* (1907), I, 120 with n. 1; Lenchantin de Gubernatis, *Appunti sull'ellenismo* (1913), 427–429; Bolisani, *Ennio minore* (1935), 119.

37 E.g. Kappelmacher, *Die Literatur* (1926), 92–93; Krug, n. 29 above and n. 44 below; Bignone, *Storia* (1946), I, 305; van der Meer, *Euhemerus* (1949), 73–75; Laughton, *The Prose of Ennius* (1951), 35–49; Rostagni, *Storia* (1954), I, 175–176; Grilli, *Studi enniani* (1965), 109–112; Fraser, *Ptolemaic Alexandria* (1972), II, 451, n. 819; Goulon, *Les citations des poètes* (1978), 116 with n. 35; Conte, *Latin Literature* (1994), 77; Jocelyn, *Ennius* (1996), 526; Suerbaum, *Q. Ennius* (2002), 131; Courtney, *The Fragmentary Latin Poets* (2003), 4; Magno, *Ennio* (2006), 75–77; Clauss, *From the Head of Zeus* (2010), 471.

38 Mariotti, *Ennius* (1967), 273.

39 Norden, *Agnostos Theos* (1913), 374–377. Similarly Kappelmacher, *Die Literatur* (1926), 93.

40 Fraenkel, *Additional Note* (1951), 51–54. See Cic. *De orat.* II 51 'Graeci quoque ipsi sic initio scriptitarunt, ut noster Cato, ut Pictor, ut Piso.' Cf. II 53. Likewise Courtney, *Archaic Latin Prose* (1999), 38–39 compares Ennius' translation style with that of fragments from the work of Pherecydes of Syros (F 68–69 Schibli).

ferent to that of Ennius.⁴¹ I also have certain doubts as to the cited definition of Scevola Mariotti (1920–2000). Ennius' style is indeed very simple but it is difficult to speak of intentional stylisation. Similarities with the style of Cato and the Annalists suggest that simplicity was a characteristic feature of artistic prose in the second century BC.

Earlier scholars did not wonder whether all the fragments cited by Lactantius reflect the authentic prose of Ennius. The first to do so was Friedrich Leo (1851–1914), who recognised this as an important issue and came to the conclusion that fragments 5, 9, 10 (in Vahlen's edition) cannot be attributed to Ennius.⁴² Alfred Kappelmacher (1876–1932) considered only fragments 3 and 7 to be authentic.⁴³ But it was Heinrich Krug who first studied the problem in such detail as to distinguish literal quotations from Lactantius' paraphrases.⁴⁴ He came to the conclusion that the authentic fragments are only the ones Lactantius cites directly using the following expressions: *Ennius in Euhemero inquit* (F 1), *haec Ennii verba sunt* (F 3), *item paulo post haec infert* (F 4), *in sacra historia sic Ennius tradit* (F 6), *cuius haec verba sunt* (F 7), *docet eadem Historia, quae dicit* (F 8), *Ennius in sacra historia sic ait* (F 11). Krug was convinced that in these places we are dealing with Ennius' original text.⁴⁵

The same problem was then also dealt with by Eric Laughton. Although Laughton could not have known about Krug's dissertation, he identified exactly the same fragments – 1, 3, 4, 6, 7, 8 and 11 – as literal citations of Ennius' Euhemerus, though he conceded these could differ slightly from Ennius' original text.⁴⁶ He had this reservation after studying how Lactantius had cited Cicero's philosophical writings⁴⁷ and noticing that even when Lactantius states something is a verbatim quotation, one may sometimes notice slight variations from Cicero's original text. The results of Laughton's

41 See Niebergall, *Griechische Religion* (1937), 41 'Der Stil des ganzen Werkes ist durchaus gehoben, feierlich, reich an alten Formen und Formeln der sacralen und Gesetzesprache. Nirgends ist Ennius so echt römisch in seinem Empfinden wie hier. Diese Würde und erschütterte Sprechweise dürfen wir für das griechische Original nicht annehmen.'

42 Leo, *Geschichte* (1913), I, 203, n. 2

43 Kappelmacher, *Die Literatur* (1926), 93.

44 Krug, *Der Stil im Euhemerus des Ennius* (1944). The dissertation remains in typescript and can be found at the University of Wrocław Archive. Krug published a summary of his work in 1948. See n. 29 above.

45 Krug, *Zum Text* (1948), 59 'dass wir an diesen Stellen den Euhemerus des Ennius wörtlich ohne jede Veränderung vor uns haben'.

46 Laughton, *The Prose of Ennius* (1951), 35–49. See Fraenkel, *Additional Note* (1951), 55–56 'here [i.e. F 5] a good deal of the original wording still shines through the paraphrase'. It is worth adding that Lausberg, *Untersuchungen zu Senecas Fragmenten* (1970), 187–188, tried to separate literal quotations from Seneca's *De superstitione* in the work of Lactantius. Also see Andrieu, *Procédés de citation* (1948), 268–293, esp. 269–277.

47 Laughton, *op. cit.*, 39–44.

study mark a certain advance on Krug's somewhat naïve conviction that Lactantius had cited Ennius word for word. But even Laughton tacitly assumed Lactantius had actually used Ennius' original text. However, it seems highly unlikely that writing the *Divinae institutiones* in Asia Minor at the start of the 4th century AD Lactantius would have had access to Ennius' original script.⁴⁸ Presumably he used the intermediary work of at least one other author (see 5 below), who probably also added his own changes to the original text. In this respect one cannot speak of original fragments, even if they reveal the features of archaic prose.⁴⁹

4. A close translation or free version?

Scholars agree that Ennius did not translate Euhemerus' work verbatim and some even wonder whether he translated all of it.⁵⁰ The Latin text includes additions concerning Roman matters, e.g. Latium etymology (*vix in Italia locum in quo lateret invenit* – T 58)⁵¹ and references to Aeneas, who in Sicily

- 48 When *Divinae institutiones* were written is discussed by Wlosok, *Lactantius* (1989), 377, 390–391. All scholars agree that Ennius' works were known until the end of the 2nd century AD. But in the 4th century only Nonius Marcellus, who lived in North Africa, still read Ennius' works and cited them in *De compendiosa doctrina*. See Vahlen, *Ennianae poesis reliquiae* (1903), XCV–XCVI; Jocelyn, *The Tragedies of Ennius* (1967), 56; Skutsch, *The Annals* (1985), 38, n. 30. On the other hand, it is hardly likely that at that time Ennius would have been read in Asia Minor, where the Greek language prevailed. Some scholars assume that in the 5th or 6th century an anonymous reader of Orosius' *Adversus paganos* (completed in 417) added three quotations from book VII of the *Annales*. (Norden, *Ennius* [1915], 79–86; Jocelyn, *loc. cit.*), but O. Skutsch, *op. cit.*, 26, probably was right to doubt this theory and gave a different explanation of the origin of these quotations.
- 49 Bignone, *Storia* (1946), I, 305, is right to state: 'Dell'Evemero di Ennio ... la maggior parte dei frammenti, o per meglio dire delle testimonianze, ci sono conservati da Lattanzio.' Also see Ogilvie, *The Library of Lactantius* (1978), 56, 'But whether the actual words are words of Ennius is not resolved [scil. on account of Laughton's article].'
- 50 Ogilvie, *loc. cit.* Albrecht, *Saturnus* (1943), 44, n. 5, perhaps goes too far in stating: 'Im übrigen ist der Euhemerus von Ennius keine knechtisch genaue Übersetzung des Originals, sondern eine Übertragung der euhemeristischen Methode der Mythen-deutung auf italische Götter.' Cf. Jacoby, *Euhemerus* (1907), 956.
- 51 Johnston (*Vergil's Conception of Saturnus* [1977], 63–69 and *Vergil's Agricultural Golden Age* [1980], esp. 65 ff.) assumes that the account of Saturn's escape to Italy and reign as a benefactor king was already present in Ennius' *Euhemerus* and this indirectly influenced Verg. *Aen.* VIII 319 ff., Tibull. II 5, 9 and Ovid. *Fasti* I 206 ff. However, I do not think this can be convincingly justified and have therefore included the three testimonia in Falsa 3–5. On the other hand, I am also not convinced by the view of Wifstrand Schiebe (*Das ideale Dasein bei Tibull* [1981], 36, 50, 135 n. 2:11 and *Vergil* [1997], 31–33) that Vergil was the original creator of the legend regarding Saturn's escape. To me the hypothesis that the tradition of Saturn's ar-

founded a city which was named after the ruler who had received him hospitably.⁵² Moreover, Ennius gave explanation to some of the Greek names: *Pluto Latine est Dis pater alii Orcum vocant* (T 54) and *ZAN KPONOY id est Latine Iuppiter Saturni* (T 69 A-B).

Some scholars believed that Ennius referred not only to the writings of Euhemerus but also those of other authors.⁵³ This assumption, however, is based on an erroneous interpretation of Cicero's statement: '*quem noster et interpretatus est et secutus praeter ceteros Ennius*' (De nat. deor. I 119 = T 14). Here the term *praeter ceteros* means other Roman supporters of Euhemerus and not other authors.⁵⁴

Ennius' translation must have included more than one book since Varro writes '*in Euhemeri libris versis*' (T 83). It is worth remembering that the original Greek version comprised at least three books (according to Athenaeus in T 77).

One should note that in several places Lactantius' text differs from Diodorus' version. For example, Lactantius writes that Jupiter '*de sui avi nomine caelum nomen indidit*' (T 62) whereas Diodorus states that Uranus '*πρῶτον θυσίας τιμῆσαι τοὺς οὐρανίους θεοὺς· διὸ καὶ Οὐρανὸν προσ-αγορευθῆναι*' (T 49). There is no consensus among scholars as to which version more faithfully reflects what Euhemerus wanted to say.⁵⁵

5. Ennius' translation in the works of Latin authors

Varro (116–27) is the earliest Latin author definitely known to have read Ennius' translation.⁵⁶ In his work *Res rusticae* he writes that Ennius used the word *gluma* (husk).⁵⁷ Many scholars assumed Lactantius took his citations

rival in Italy had existed before Vergil seems more convincing. Thus Lovejoy, Boas, *Primitivism* (1935), 57; Gatz, *Weltalter* (1967), 124 (Varro's *De vita populi Romani* was a source for Vergil and Pompeius Trogus); Kubusch, *Aurea Saecula* (1986), 104–105. I believe we cannot rule out that Ennius' *Euhemerus* played a certain role in shaping the Saturn in Italy tradition.

52 Euhem. T 64 A 'conditae urbi Acestae hospitis nomen inposuit, ut eam postmodum laetus ac libens Acestes diligeret augeter ornaret.'

53 Vahlen, *Ennianae poesis reliquiae* (1903), CCXXI; Bolisani, *Ennio* (1935), 120.

54 See e.g. Riese, *Die communis historia des Lutatius* (1863), 450; Skutsch, *Ennius* (1907), 2600; Lenchantin de Gubernatis, *Appunti* (1913), 426; Garbarino, *Roma e la filosofia* (1973), II, 289–290; Canfora, *Sull'Euhemerus di Ennio* (1993), 320–321 (Who mistakenly attributes to me Vahlen's point of view, which I had clearly rejected in a commentary to Euhem. T 14).

55 See chapter II 5, n. 67.

56 Thus e.g. Némethy, *Euhemeri reliquiae* (1889), 17; Jacoby, *Euemeros* (1907), 956. Cf. van der Meer, *Euhemerus* (1949), 95. Perhaps only A. Breysig, BPhW 11, 1891, 423, believed Varro read the original Greek version.

57 Varro, *Res rust.* I 48, 2 = Euhem. T 83 = Ennius F 13 Vahlen.

of Ennius from a work by Varro,⁵⁸ but others have rightly noted that this assumption cannot be verified.⁵⁹ On the other hand, it does seem probable that the grammarian Festus (2nd century AD) referred directly to the writings of Varro.⁶⁰

It is debatable whether Cicero (*De nat. deor.* I 118–119 = T 14) knew Ennius' translation. Some believe that this was his source concerning Euhemerus,⁶¹ while others assume he read the Greek original.⁶² To me it seems probable that Cicero knew both the Greek original as well as the Latin translation.

Felix Jacoby (1876–1959)⁶³ assumed that Senator Manilius, to whom Pliny the Elder refers when writing about the phoenix (*Nat. hist.* X 3–4 = T 84), had read Ennius' translation. Yet there is no evidence to support this. Pliny refers to Euhemerus twice (I 36; XXXVI 79 = *Dubia* T 80) but it is difficult to say whether he read the original or the translation.⁶⁴

Above I have tried to show how unlikely it is that Lactantius would have read Ennius' translation.⁶⁵ That is why scholars have searched for an indirect source. Many pointed to Varro's *Antiquitates rerum divinarum* (see n. 58) but others noted that this could not be proved (see n. 59). Some stressed that Varro did not have as great an influence on Lactantius as he did on other Christian writers (e.g. Tertullian and Arnobius).⁶⁶ A quite unique view was held by Ernst Bickel (1876–1961), who believed Lactantius' source was Cornelius Labeo (3rd century AD).⁶⁷ A.S. Gratwick, who maintains that En-

58 Mewaldt, *Die Überlieferung über den Euhemerus* (1912), 42–43; Geffcken, *Euhemerism* (1912), 573; Vallauri, *Evemero* (1956), 8; Fraser, *Ptolemaic Alexandria* (1972), II, 451, n. 819.

59 Kappelmacher, *Die Literatur* (1926), 93. Cf. Leo, *Geschichte* (1913), I, 203, n. 1.

60 Fest. *De verb. signif.* p. 408 Lindsay = T 73. See Helm, *Pompeius Festus* (1952), 2317; Dihle, *Verrius Flaccus* (1958), 1640.

61 Vallauri, *op. cit.*, 12.

62 Vahlen, *Ennianae poesis reliquiae* (1903), LIII. Cf. van Gils, *Quaestiones* (1902), 66 'Cicero, de quo non liquet utrum ipsum Euhemerum inspexerit necne.' Mewaldt, *loc. cit.*, makes a quite improbable assumption that Cicero gained his information about Euhemerus from Varro's *Antiquitates rerum divinarum*.

63 Jacoby, *op. cit.*, 956.

64 Most scholars believe that Pliny had read the original. Among others: Némethy, *Euhemerii reliquiae* (1889), 18; Susemihl, *Geschichte* (1891), I, 321, n. 57; Zucker, *Euhemerios* (1905), 468. See Breysig, *loc. cit.* On Pliny's sources in *Plin. Nat. hist.* VII 197, see my commentary to *Euhem.* T 81.

65 Apart from Krug and Laughton, this view was held by Vahlen, *op. cit.*, LXXXVIII; Waszink, *Entretiens sur l'Antiquité classique* 17, 1972, 351 (a voice in the debate) and more recently by Canfora, *Sull' Euhemerus di Ennio* (1993), 321 and Suerbaum, *Q. Ennius* (2002), 131.

66 E.g. Waszink, *Varrone nella letteratura cristiana* (1976), 220. Cf. Ogilvie, *The Library* (1978), 50–55.

67 Bickel, *Lehrbuch* (1961), 307. Moreover, he believed that Cornelius Labeo had read Ennius' translation, though he did not produce any arguments to support this hypothesis.

nius' translation was written in verse, put forward a hypothesis according to which Lactantius' direct sources was 'a prose version intended for use as a schoolbook.'⁶⁸ Robert Maxwell Ogilvie noted that all of the citations from Ennius concern Jupiter and only in chapters (c. 11, 13, 14, 17, 22) of book I of the *Divinae institutiones*. On this basis he concluded that 'an *Aratea* commentary was the immediate source of almost all the material.'⁶⁹ This is a noteworthy observation because one cannot rule out that Lactantius had access to only a limited number of quotations from Ennius' work. On the other hand, I am not convinced Lactantius used a commentary to the writings of Aratus of Soli. The above review of diverse opinions shows how difficult it is to determine Lactantius' direct source.

Some scholars presumed that Firmicus Maternus (4th century AD) could have known Ennius' translation,⁷⁰ but others rightly do not share this opinion.⁷¹ On the other hand, there is general consensus that Augustine (354–430) had merely had indirect contact with Ennius' book.⁷² The only contentious issue concerns the person thanks to whom Augustine learned of this work.⁷³

The works of eight Latin poets (from the 1st century BC to the 5th century AD) mention *Panchaia/Panchaea* as a country from where incense came and in these works we also find adjectives such as *Panchaeus*, *Panchaius*, *Panchaicus* together with nouns such as *odor*, *tus*, etc.⁷⁴ The earliest men-

68 Gratwick, *Ennius* (1982), 158.

69 Ogilvie, *The Library* (1978), 56–57. Cf. Magno, *Ennio* (2006), 77 'perciò è probabile che dell'*Euhemerus* circolassero solo più alcuni sunti, riportanti passi, o, meglio, parole enniane: servivano per dimostrare l'origine umana degli dei pagani'.

70 Firm. Mat. *De errore prof. rel.* 7, 1–6 = Dubia T 93; 10, 1 = Dubia T 91. Thus Moore, *Iulius Firmicus* (1897), 31; Boll, *Firmicus* (1909), 2379; Kerényi, *Die griechisch-orientalische Romanliteratur* (1927), 101, n. 28; Ziegler, *Firmicus Maternus* (1969), 951–952 'die Möglichkeit, daß er ... den Euhemerus des Ennius gelesen hat, ist dagegen ernsthaft zu erwägen.' See Némethy, *Euhemeri reliquiae* (1889), 28.

71 E.g. W. Kroll, BPhW 17, 1897, 1480; van Gils, *Quaestiones* (1902), 117–118; Jacoby, *Euemeros* (1907), 955; Wendland, *Die hellenistisch-römische Kultur* (1912), 122, n. 1; van der Meer, *Euhemerus* (1949), 93; Schippers, *De ontwikkeling der euhemeristische godencritiek* (1952), 88–89; Hocheisel, *Das Urteil über die nicht-christlichen Religionen* (1972), 338.

72 Aug. *De civ. Dei* VI 7, VII 27 = T 11–12; *De cons. evang.* I 23, 32 = T 13; *Epist.* 17, 1 = T 59.

73 Némethy, *Euhemeri reliquiae* (1889), 27; *idem*, *Quaestiones Euhemereae* (1900), 126 (unknown source); Leo, *Geschichte* (1913), I, 203, n. 1; Vahlen, *Augustinus und Ennius' Euhemerus* (1923), 534 (Cicero and Lactantius); Nailis, *Aurelius Augustinus en Euhemerus* (1939/1941), 87–88 (commentary to Vergil); Schelkle, *Virgil in der Deutung Augustins* (1939), 150 (Lactantius); Hagendahl, *Augustine and the Latin Classics* (1967), I, 104, n. 2 (Lactantius).

74 Lucret. II 417 (T 40); Verg. *Georg.* II 139, IV 379 (T 41 A-B), Ps.-Verg. *Culex* 87 (T 41 C); Ps.-Tib. III 2, 23 (T 42); Ovid. *Met.* X 309, X 478 (T 43 A-B); Valer. Flacc. VI 119 (not present in my edition); Lact. *De ave phoenice* 88 (T 46); Claud. *De raptu Pros.* 81, *De tertio consul. Honor.* 211, *De nuptiis Honor.* 94 (T 47 A-C); Sidon.

tioning appears in the work of Lucretius, and that is most probably why it has been assumed other poets relied on him.⁷⁵ It seems to me, however, that these expressions became a poetic *locus communis*; that is why we should not ask on which source a given poet had relied.

6. Summary

Ennius translated Euhemerus' work in the years 200–194 to prepare the way for the eventual deification of Scipio Africanus. This was a free prose translation, because Ennius expanded the original text and added his own explanations of Greek names. The translation was definitely read by Varro and most probably by Cicero. On the other hand, Lactantius, who gave the twelve 'quotations' in the *Divinae institutiones*, did not have direct access to it. That is why the fragments from *Euhemerus sive Sacra historia* cannot be considered authentic even if seven of them reveal features of archaic prose.

Apoll. *Carm.* V 47 (T 48). Also see Apul. *De mundo* 35 (T 44); Arnob. *Adv. nat.* VII 27 (T 45).

75 E.g. Jacoby, *Euemeris* (1907), 954 and Lilja, *The Treatment of Odours* (1972), 44. However, van Gils, *Quaestiones* (1902), 99, believed the Roman poets relied on senator Manilius or some other author. This was in reference to view expressed by Kuiper, *De Ezechiele* (1900), 277. Cf. Ziegler, *Panchāia* (1949), 494, 'stammt das aus hellenistischer Dichtung oder ist es alles Nachwirkung des Euhemeris des Ennius?'

VIII. Euhemerism in the ancient world

1. Pagan literature

A. Euhemerus and Euhemerism

The author of the *Ἱερὰ Ἀναγραφὴ* (c. 300 BC) wanted to show that the Olympian gods were deified people. That is why Euhemerism is *sensu stricto* the reduction of the Olympian gods to the role of deified humans. It is not proper to call Euhemerism the apotheosis of people who had achieved things for humanity, as this concept had existed before Euhemerus.¹ The notion of the apotheosis of people stemmed from three other concepts: euergetism,² the conviction that Heracles and other heroes had been deified³ as well as the theory of the Sophist Prodicus stating that religion emerged out of a sense of gratitude.⁴ In discussing the reception of Euhemerism I shall nevertheless take into account the view that it was the performing of benefactions (εὐεργεσία) which led to deification because Euhemerism is so perceived by many scholars. On the other hand, it is decidedly wrong to term rationalistic interpretations of myths as Euhemerism⁵. Nor was it writing about the tombs of certain gods, since the tradition of the deaths and tombs of particular deities (Zeus and Dionysus) preceded Euhemerus.⁶ Nevertheless, one has to admit the Christian writers willingly used this tradition to show that the pagan gods were ordinary human beings.

One should add that scholars sometimes use the concept of positive and negative Euhemerism.⁷ The latter appears in the works of Christian authors

1 The differences between the views of Euhemerus and Euhemerism are discussed, among others, by Thraede, *Euhemerismus* (1966), 881–882 and Wifstrand Schiebe, *Vergil* (1997), 78–79. Also see Meijer, *Philosophers* (1981), 231, n. 45 ‘The essence of euhemerism is not deification of men (as already is found probably in Prodicus...) but in self-deification of men.’

2 See chapter III 2 B.

3 See chapter III 2 A a.

4 See chapter III 2 D.

5 As was already stated by: Decharme, *La critique des traditions religieuses* (1904), 371–372, 393; de Block, *Évhémère* (1876), 117–119; Nilsson, *Geschichte* (1988), II, 284; Hani, *La religion égyptienne* (1976), 134; Stern, *Rationalizing Myth* (1999), 219 ‘The euhemeristic tradition must be carefully distinguished from the Palaeophatean.’ On the rationalistic interpretation of myths, see chapter III 2 C.

6 See chapter III B 1 c.

7 Wardman, *Religion and Statecraft* (1982), 55–56; Schippers, *De ontwikkeling der euhemeristische godencritiek* (1952), 41 ff., 103 ff. (*euhemerismus inversus*).

(the earliest being those of Athenagoras and Tertullian) who believed that the deified rulers were not benefactors (εὐεργέται) but wicked people who committed many evil deeds.

I do not consider as accurate Roland Baumgarten's view according to which real Euhemerism was the deification of powerful rulers. He is of the opinion that the deification of inventors was part of a tradition stemming from Prodicus and Persaeus ('Prodikos-Persaios-Strang'), while the self-deification of powerful rulers belonged to the 'Euhemerios-Strang'.⁸ In my opinion, this contrast is an oversimplification. After all, Euhemerus himself wrote that rulers were inventors and benefactors.⁹ In the *Ἱερὰ Ἀναγραφή* he linked the idea of euergetism with the ruler cult which had already emerged towards the end of the 5th century¹⁰ because in his opinion deification was the combination of royal authority (βασιλεία) with benefactions (εὐεργεσία). The heuremastic tradition naturally continued to exist independently of Euhemerism, though both 'might well borrow and adopt motifs from each other.'¹¹

B. Euhemerism and the ruler cult

It seems that common source of both Euhemerism and the ruler cult was euergetism. Already in the epic poetry of Homer we come across the conviction that one could call a god someone who performed something of benefit to an individual, a group of people or an entire society, in other words that person became an εὐεργέτης or σωτήρ.¹² Underlying this view is the conviction that one of the most important features of a deity is doing things of benefit to people. By becoming a benefactor a person likens himself to a deity. At the start of the Hellenistic period benefaction was primarily performed by kings and euergetism was considered an attribute of the Hellenistic monarch. That is why many Greeks felt that their βασιλεὺς εὐεργέτης deserved a divine cult, although there can be no doubt a clear distinction was made between the immortal Olympian gods and mortal rulers.¹³

8 Baumgarten, *Heiliges Wort* (1998), 194.

9 Uranus was the first to offer sacrifices to the heavenly gods (Diod. VI 1, 8 = T 49); Jupiter ended cannibalism (Lact. *Div. inst.* I 13, 2 = T 66) and 'hominibus leges mores frumentaue paravit multaque alia bona fecit' (Lact. *Div. inst.* I 11, 45 = T 69 A, cf. T 69 B); Venus invented 'ars meretricia' (Lact. *Div. inst.* I 17, 10 = T 75 A, cf. T 75 B) and astrology (Hyg. *De astron.* II 42, 5 = T 74); Aeacus, the son of Zeus, discovered gold ore on Panchaea (Plin. *Nat. hist.* VII 197 = T 81; Hyg. *Fab.* 274, 4 = T 82 A; Cassiod. *Var.* IV 34, 3 = T 82 B). See my commentary to Euhem. T 81.

10 See chapter III 2 E.

11 Cole, *Democritus* (1990), 48. Also see Thraede, *Erfinder* (1962), 1219–1221; Cole, *op. cit.*, 48–50, 153–155.

12 See chapter III 2 B.

13 See chapter III 2 E.

It seems that the Ἰερὰ Ἀναγραφὴ did not contribute to the introduction of the θεοὶ ἄδελφοί cult in 272/271, that is the self-deification of Ptolemy II and his wife Arsinoe II.¹⁴ The Egyptian rulers by no means supported Euhemerus' concept, and Callimachus, associated with the Ptolemaic court, fiercely attacked Euhemerus' book.¹⁵ By presenting the origins of religion, Euhemerus joined the debate regarding the ruler cult, but we cannot say whether he merely wished to explain how it began or whether he also wanted to justify and promote it among the Greeks. It seems that Euhemerus' book had no impact on the spreading of the ruler cult. It certainly did not inspire the advisors of Antiochus I, the king of Commagene, to found a cult of their monarch in the 1st century BC.¹⁶

Euhemerism and the ruler cult appear as similar phenomena because they stem from a common source, the concept of euergetism.

C. Euhemerism in mythological novels

a. Dionysius Scytobrachion

The Ἰερὰ Ἀναγραφὴ had a direct influence on the authors of mythological novels. These novels follow a set pattern, A ruler (e.g. Dionysus, Ammon or Osiris) travels around the world and wins battles that allow him to rule the oikumene. He becomes a benefactor by making various inventions as well as providing just laws. Eventually they are deified by their grateful subjects.¹⁷ The best known of these are the *Libyan Stories* of Dionysius Scytobrachion (3rd century BC), which tell of the Libyan Amazons, Atlantioi and the deeds of Dionysus. Fragments of this work have survived in Diodorus Siculus' *Bibliotheca historica*.¹⁸ Dionysius combined diverse myths into a very in-

14 See chapter III 2 F b.

15 See chapter I 1.

16 See chapter. VI 3 b. Cf. Taeger, *Charisma* (1957), I, 396 'Für den Herrscherkult als religionsgeschichtliche Erscheinung ist sein Buch ... völlig bedeutungslos.'

17 Jacoby, *Euemeros* (1907), 971. Cf. *idem*, *F Gr Hist Ia* (1957), 509 'charakteristisch für sie [scil. Romane] ... ist vor allem der schwindel mit alten quellen (F 7 c. 52, 3, F 8 c. 66, 4–6. 67, 5) darunter auch ἐπιχώριοι der wunderländer (F 8 c. 67, 5), der durchgeführte rationalismus in der heroensage, der Euhemerismus und synkretismus in der göttergeschichte.'

18 On Dionysius Scytobrachion, see Bethe, *Quaestiones Diodoreae mythographae* (1887), esp. 5–24; Schwartz, *Dionysios Scytobrachion* (1903), esp. 929–932; Brown, *Euhemerus and the Historians* (1946), 267–271; Jacoby, *FGrHist Ia*, 509–517; Vallauri, *Origine e diffusione dell'evemerismo* (1960), 22–27; Rusten, *Dionysius Scytobrachion* (1982). Until recently it was believed Scytobrachion lived in the 2nd century. This changed only when Rusten, *op.cit.*, 19–29, proved that he was already writing in the 3rd century BC because *P. Hibeh* 186, which includes fragments of his work on the Argonauts, originates from around 200 BC. See chapter III 2 A,

teresting whole purely to entertain the reader.¹⁹ He makes clear allusions to Euhemerus' book. In order to make his account plausible, he refers to Linus' Ὑπομνήματα, written in Pelasgian (Πελασγικοῖς γράμμασιν), which include stories of the deeds of Dionysus.²⁰ Information about the upbringing of Dionysus in Nysa was to have been found in a script called Φρυγία ποίησις by Thymoites, who supposedly lived in the time of Orpheus and passed on what he had heard from the inhabitants of Nysa.²¹ Scytobrachion described two islands: Hespera on Lake Tritonis²² and an island in the river Triton on which the city of Nysa was founded.²³ In his descriptions of these places he used the *locus amoenus* convention.²⁴ His history of the Atlantioi most closely resembles Euhemerus' work.²⁵ Their first king was Uranus, who was interested in astrology, united dispersed inhabitants and taught them to farm the land. The grateful people deified the deceased ruler and his name was given to the sky.²⁶ Divine honours were also awarded to Titaia, the wife of Uranus, on account of the many good things she had done.²⁷ After the death of the first royal couple, the throne was taken over by their oldest daughter Basileia, who brought up her four younger brothers and two younger sisters. She then married one of her brothers, Hyperion, for whom she bore Helios and Selene. Hyperion and his son Helios were murdered, and out of despair Selene, called φιλάδελφος, committed suicide. Then in a dream Helios appeared to his mourning mother Basileia and told her he and his sister had

n. 86. The Amazons of Libya: Diod. III 52–55 = F Gr Hist 32 F 7 = F 2–5 Rusten; Atlantioi: III 56–57.60 = F 7 J. = F 6–7 R.; Dionysus of Libya: III 66–74, 1 = F 8 J. = F 8–10.12 R.; III 61, 1–3 = F 11 R.; III 61, 4–6 = F 7 J. = F 13 R. Scytobrachion was also the author of a novel about the Argonauts: Diod. IV 40–55.

19 Jacoby, *FGrHist I a* (1957), p. 513 'diese kontamination, die das interesse der leser durch möglichsten reichthum des stoffes zu fesseln sucht und von den vorgängern nur den stoff, nicht die philosophischen, kulturhistorischen, naturwissenschaftlichen theorieen nimmt, ist für Dionysios charakteristisch.' This view was accepted by Brown, *op.cit.*, 268; Ferguson, *Utopias* (1975), 123; Rusten, *op.cit.*, 112.

20 Diod. III 67, 4 = F 8 R = Linus 55 T Bernabé. Linus was said to have invented letters (Tac. *Ann.* XI 14, 2), and according to the *Suda* s.v. Λίνος (III 273 Adler) he had brought writing over from Phoenicia to Greece. See Corcella, *Dionisio* (1987), 41–82; Bremmer, *Linus* (1999), 252–253.

21 Diod. III 67, 5 = F 8 R.

22 Diod. III 53, 4–5 = F 8 R.

23 Diod. III 68, 5 = F 8 R.

24 On the *locus amoenus* convention, see chapter II 4 B.

25 I accept the reconstruction of this work proposed by Rusten, *op. cit.*, 107–112. On the Atlantioi, see Nesselrath, *Atlantes* (2001), 34–38.

26 Diod. III 56, 5 = F 6 R. μετὰ δὲ τὴν ἐξ ἀνθρώπων αὐτοῦ μετástασιν διὰ τε τὰς εὐεργεσίας καὶ τὴν τῶν ἄστρον ἐπίγνωσιν ἀθανάτους τιμὰς ἀπονεῖμαι. Cf. Euhem. T 49.

27 Diod. III 57, 2 = F 6 R. τὴν δὲ Τιταίαν, σῶφρονα οὖσαν καὶ πολλῶν ἀγαθῶν αἰτίαν γενομένην τοῖς λαοῖς, ἀποθεωθῆναι μετὰ τὴν τελευταίην ὑπὸ τῶν εὐ παθόντων Γῆν μετονομασθεῖσαν.

joined the gods and their names were now given to the sun and the moon.²⁸ Later, distraught with the loss of her loved ones, Basileia lost her mind and started to wonder around the world. Finally she disappeared in a storm,²⁹ and the Atlantioi then began worshipping Helios, Selene and Basileia as gods.³⁰ After Hyperion's death, the kingdom was divided between Uranus' sons Atlas and Cronus. One of Atlas' sons was Hesperus, who distinguished himself as an exceptionally pious and just person. While observing the stars on the top of Mount Atlas, he was suddenly abducted. That is why the people gave him divine honours.³¹ Atlas' seven daughters were also deified.³²

However, the chief role in the *Libyan Stories* was played by Dionysus, son of Ammon and Amalthea. When Cronus attacked Nysa, Dionysus defeated the invading army. However, he treated his prisoners of war with clemency, who out of gratitude honoured him as a god³³ and willingly joined his army. It was then that Aristaeus, Dionysus' guardian, was the first to lay an offering to him as a god.³⁴ Eventually Dionysus defeated Cronus and Rhea, but also showed them and their son, Zeus, mercy. Already before the battle the Libyans had told Dionysus that his father Ammon had foretold that he, Dionysus, would reclaim his father's lost kingdom and, after conquering the world, would be worshipped as a god.³⁵ That is why Dionysus founded Ammon's oracle, who foretold him he would achieve immortality by granting people benefactions.³⁶ Dionysus next began his travels around the world, starting with Egypt, making Zeus that country's ruler. He got as far as India, performing benefactions on the way, for which he was given of-

28 Diod. III 57, 5 = F 6 R. ἐαυτὸν δὲ καὶ τὴν ἀδελφὴν εἰς ἀθανάτους φύσει μετασχηματισθήσεσθαι θεῖα τινὶ προνοίᾳ.

29 On the ἀφανισμός, see Pfister, *Der Reliquienkult* (1912), II, 480–489; Pease, *Some Aspects of Invisibility* (1942), 1–36; Schilling, *La déification* (1980), 137–152 (the disappearance and deification of Latinus, Aeneas and Romulus); Lacroix, *Quelques exemples de disparitions* (1988), 183–198.

30 Diod. III 57, 8 = F 6 R. τοὺς δ' ὄχλους θαυμάσαντας τὴν περιπέτειαν τὸν μὲν Ἥλιον καὶ τὴν Σελήνην τῇ προσηγορίᾳ καὶ ταῖς τιμαῖς μεταγαγεῖν ἐπὶ τὰ κατ' οὐρανὸν ἄστρον, τὴν δὲ μητέρα τούτων θεὸν τε νομίσαι καὶ βωμοὺς ἰδρύσασθαι.

31 Diod. III 60, 3 = F 7 R. διὰ δὲ τὴν ἀρετὴν αὐτοῦ τὸ πάθος τὰ πλήθη ἐλέησαντα τιμὰς ἀθανάτους ἀπονείμει καὶ τὸν ἐπιφανέστατον τῶν κατὰ τὸν οὐρανὸν ἀστέρων ὁμωνύμως ἐκείνῳ προσαγορεῦσαι.

32 Diod. III 60, 5 = F 7 R. ὑπάρξει δ' αὐτὰς καὶ σώφρονας διαφερόντως, καὶ μετὰ τὴν τελευταίαν τύχειν ἀθανάτου τιμῆς παρ' ἀνθρώπων {καὶ} καθιδρυθείσας ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ καὶ τῇ τῶν Πλειάδων προσηγορίᾳ περιληφθείσας.

33 Diod. III 71, 5 = F 10 R. διὰ δὲ τὸ παράδοξον τῆς σωτηρίας προσκυνεῖν αὐτὸν ὡς θεόν.

34 Diod. III 72, 1 = F 10 R. μυθολογοῦσιν Ἀρισταῖον τὸν ἐπιστάτην αὐτοῦ θυσίαν τε παραστήσαι καὶ πρῶτον ἀνθρώπων ὡς θεῷ θῆσαι.

35 Diod. III 73, 1 = F 12 R. καὶ τὴν τε πατρίαν ἀνακτήσεσθαι βασιλείαν καὶ πάσης τῆς οἰκουμένης κυριεύσαντα θεὸν νομισθήσεσθαι.

36 Diod. III 73, 3 = F 12 R. καὶ λαβεῖν παρὰ τοῦ πατρὸς χρησμὸν ὅτι τοὺς ἀνθρώπους εὐεργετῶν τεύξεται τῆς ἀθανασίας.

ferings as a god.³⁷ After returning from India, he fought the Titans in defence of his father Ammon on Crete. After the deaths of Ammon and Dionysus, both of whom achieved immortality, young Zeus began ruling the world.³⁸

b. Dinarchus of Delos

In his work Dinarchus presented Dionysus as an ordinary man who, after a spectacular expedition to India, was killed in Argos by Perseus and buried in Delphi.³⁹ The poet Dinarchus may have lived at the turn of the 3rd century BC.⁴⁰

c. The ‘Phrygian Literature’

In the Hellenistic period there appeared works entitled the Φρύγιοι λόγοι and Φρύγια γράμματα,⁴¹ which probably gave an Euhemeristic interpretation of myths about Isis being identified with the Mother of Gods.⁴² I once proposed a hypothesis that in the Hellenistic period the Φρύγιοι λόγοι were attributed to Diagoras of Melos⁴³ precisely because Euhemerism was considered in certain circles as something impious or even atheistic.⁴⁴ Of course not all works attributed to the ‘Phrygian literature’ would have to concern Isis or Cybele.⁴⁵

37 Diod. III 73, 5 = F 12 R. πάντας δὲ προθύμως ὑπακούοντας ἐπαίνους καὶ θυσίαις ὡς θεὸν τιμᾶν.

38 Diod. III 73, 8 = F 12 R. μετὰ δὲ ταῦτα Ἄμμωνος καὶ Διονύσου μεταστάντων ἐκ τῆς ἀνθρωπίνης φύσεως εἰς τὴν ἀθανασίαν.

39 Dinarch. FGrHist 399 F 1 a ap. Syncel. *Ecl. chronogr.* 307 p. 190 Mosshammer; F 1 b ap. Malal. *Chronogr.* II 15 p. 32 Thurn. See Piérart, *La mort de Dionysos* (1996), 141–151; *idem*, *Le tombeau de Dionysos* (1996), 137–154.

40 According to Bethe, *Deinarchos* (1901), 2389. Cf. Wilamowitz-Moellendorf, *Hellenistische Dichtung* (1924), I, 104.

41 On the ‘Phrygian Literature’, see Parmentier, *Traité d’Isis et d’Osiris* (1913), 15–20; Winiarczyk, *Diagoras* (1980), 58–65; Rives, *Phrygian Tales* (2005), 223–244. Φρύγιοι λόγοι: Plut. *De daedal. Plat.* fr. 157 Sandbach ap. Eus. *Praep. ev.* III 1, 1 (=Diagoras T 94 Winiarczyk); Tat. *Or. ad Gr.* 27 (= Diag. T 68); Ael. *Var. hist.* XII 45; Ael. *Nat. an.* II 21; Damasc. *Dubit. et solut.* 282 (=Diag. T 95). Φρύγια γράμματα: Plut. *De Is. et Os.* 29 p. 362 B (=Diag. T 97); *Phrygiae litterae*: Cic. *Nat. deor.* III 42 (=Diag. T 98). Φρύγιος λόγος: Ps.-Democr. DK 68 B 299e; Plut. *De def. orac.* 10, 415 A (Diag. T 93).

42 Thus Decharme, *La critique* (1904), 133; Reitzenstein, *Poimandres* (1904), 164–165.

43 On Diagoras see e.g. Jacoby, *Diagoras* (1959); Woodbury, *The Date and Atheism of Diagoras* (1965), 178–211; Winiarczyk, *Diagoras* (1979), 191–213; Winiarczyk, *Diagoras* (1980), 51–75; Smarczyk, *Untersuchungen zur Religionspolitik* (1990), 278–287; Aouad, Brissou, *Diagoras* (1994), 750–757; Rubel, *Stadt in Angst* (2000), 166–172; Hordern, *Philodemus* (2001), 33–38.

44 Winiarczyk, *op. cit.*, 64–65.

45 For example the title Φρυγία ποίησις stems from the fact that the author was supposed to be the grandson of the Trojan (i.e. Phrygian) king Laomedon. An erroneous

D. Stoic Euhemerism

For Stoics there was basically only one god, a rational and active principle that pervades the world and controls it. It was called *logos* or the fiery *pneuma*, identified with nature (φύσις), destiny (εἰμαρμένη) or providence (πρόνοια). Stoics did actually believe one could call god visible manifestations of this eternal deity but stressed that such gods would cease to exist when the world was consumed by fire (ἐκπύρωσις).⁴⁶ These were the gods of folk belief (*theologia mythica* or *fabulosa*) or ones worshipped by political communities (*theologia politica* or *civilis*),⁴⁷ which were willingly interpreted allegorically, i.e. that they symbolised an immanent deity in its various aspects.⁴⁸ The Stoic school systematically discussed the question

interpretation is found in: Gruppe, *Die griechischen Culte* (1887), 508. Nock, *AJPh* 63, 1942, 221, n. 28, reprint in *idem, Essays* (1972), II, 556, n. 28 supposed that the Φρύγια γράμματα were ‘a learned Euhemerizing work, bearing on the old problem (Her. II 2) of the claims of Egypt and Phrygia for priority in culture.’

- 46 On Stoic theology, see e.g. Zeller, *Die Philosophie* (1909), III 1, 141–152; Pohlenz, *Die Stoa* (1948–1949), I, 93–98, II 53–55; Long, Sedley, *The Hellenistic Philosophers* (1987), I, 323–333; II, 321–332; Gerson, *God and Greek Philosophy* (1990), 142–153, 289–293; Steinmetz, *Die Stoa* (1994), esp. 539–540, 609–610, 652–654; Mansfeld, *Theology* (1999), 457–462; Sedley, *The Origins of Stoic God* (2002), 41–83; Algra, *Stoic Theology* (2003), 153–178; Drozdek, *Greek Philosophers* (2007), 229–245. See Aët. Plac. I 6, 1 p. 292–293 Diels ap. Ps.-Plut. Plac. phil. 879 C (SVF II 1009) ὀρίζονται δὲ τὴν τοῦ θεοῦ οὐσίαν οἱ Στωϊκοὶ οὕτως. πνεῦμα νοερὸν καὶ πυρῶδες, οὐκ ἔχον μὲν μορφήν, μεταβάλλον δ' εἰς ὃ βούλεται καὶ συνεξομοιούμενον πᾶσιν. Chrysip. (SVF II 300) ap. Diog. VII 134 τὸ δὲ ποιοῦν τὸν ἐν αὐτῇ (scil. τῇ ὅλῃ) λόγον, τὸν θεόν. τοῦτον γὰρ ἄϊδιον ὄντα διὰ πάσης αὐτῆς δημιουργεῖν ἕκαστα. Cf. Chrysip. (SVF II 1021) ap. Diog. Laert. VII 147. Chrysip. (SVF II 1025) ap. Lact. Div. inst. I 5, 20 ‘Chrysippus naturalem vim divina ratione praeditam, inter-dum divinam necessitatem deum nuncupat.’
- 47 Stoics willingly used the *theologia tripartita*, which ‘wenigstens in ihrer Systematisierung auf Panaetius zurückgeführt werden kann’ (Steinmetz, *Die Stoa* [1994], 653). See Varro, *Ant. rer. div. fr.* 6 a Cardauns ap. Aug. *Civ. Dei* VI 12 ‘Nunc propter tres theologias, quas Graeci dicunt mythicen, physicen, politicen, Latine autem dici possunt fabulosa, naturalis, civilis’; Varro fr. 6 b ap. Aug. *Civ. Dei* VI 5 ‘Deinde illud quale est, quod tria genera theologiae dicit (scil. Varro) esse, id est rationis quae de dis explicatur, eorumque unum mythicon appellari, alterum physicon, tertium civile?’ See e.g. Lieberg, *Die ‘theologia tripartita’* (1973), 63–115; Pépin, *Mythe et allégorie* (1976), 13–32, 276–392; Schiavone, *Nascita della giurisprudenza* (1977), 5–68; Lieberg, *Die Theologia tripartita* (1982), 25–53; Dörrie, *Zu Varros Konzeption der theologia tripartita* (1986), 76–82; Dihle, *Die Theologia tripartita bei Augustin* (1996), 183–202; Lehmann, *Varron théologien* (1997), 171–183, 193–225.
- 48 See Steinmetz, *Allegorische Deutung* (1986), 18–30; Most, *Cornutus and Stoic Allegoresis* (1989), esp. 2018–2029. Cf. Long, *Stoic Readings of Homer* (1992), 41–66, reprint in *idem, Stoic Studies* (1996), 58–84; Boys-Stones, *The Stoics Two Types of Allegory* (2003), 189–216; Goulet, *La méthode allégorique* (2005), 93–119; Gourinat, *Explicatio fabularum* (2005), 9–34. On allegoresis, see e.g. Müller, *Allegorische Dichtererklärung* (1924), 16–22; Wehrli, *Zur Geschichte der allegorischen Dich-*

of 'from where people acquired the concept of gods' and distinguished as many as seven types of divine being. The last category were the deified benefactors of humanity.⁴⁹ Such an interpretation was initiated by Persaeus of Citium (c. 305 – 243), who referred to the theory of the Sophist Prodicus in his work *Περὶ θεῶν*.⁵⁰ The Stoics transformed the views of Prodicus into a religio-historical method that also allowed for the inclusion of oriental mythologies.⁵¹ This method was willingly applied by historians, the authors of mythological and doxographical handbooks⁵² as well as later also by Christian apologists. It was frequently expressed in the statement that εὐεργεσία led to apotheosis,⁵³ in reference to *homines pro diis culti* lists⁵⁴ or in the *deos homines fuisse* formula.⁵⁵ Gods were also divided into two groups (the *theologia dipertita*). One included immortal gods (*dei certi et sempiterni*),

tung Homers (1928); Tate, *On the History of Allegorism* (1934), 105–114; Joosen, Waszink, *Allegorese* (1950), 283–293; Hunger, *Allegorische Mythendeutung* (1954), 35–54; Buffière, *Les mythes d'Homère* (1956); Griffiths, *Allegory in Greece and Egypt* (1967), 79–102, esp. 79–89; Richardson, *Homeric Professors in the Age of the Sophists* (1975), 65–81; Bernard, *Zwei verschiedene Methoden der Allegorese* (1997), 63–83.

- 49 Aët. *Plac.* I 6, 15 p. 296–297 Diels ap. Ps.-Plut. *Plac. phil.* 880 C ἔβδομον δὲ (scil. εἶδος τῶν θεῶν) καὶ ἐπὶ πᾶσι τὸ διὰ τὰς εἰς τὸν κοινὸν βίον εὐεργεσίας ἐκτεταμημένον ἀνθρώπινον δὲ γεννηθέν, ὡς Ἡρακλέα ὡς Διοσκούρου ὡς Διόνυσον.
- 50 Persaeus (SVF I 448) ap. Cic. *Nat. deor.* I 38 'at Persaeus eiusdem Zenonis auditor eos esse habitos deos a quibus aliqua magna utilitas ad vitae cultum esset inventa, ipsasque res utiles et salutare deorum esse vocabulis nuncupatas.'; Philod. *P. Herc.* 1428 col. II 28 – III 13 (ed. A. Henrichs, *CrErc* 4 [1974] 13–14 = *De piet.* p. 75–76 Gomperz = p. 117 Schober); Min. Fel. *Oct.* 21, 2 'Prodicus adsumptos in deos loquitur, qui errando inventis novis frugibus utilitati hominum profuerunt. in eandem sententiam et Persaeus philosophatur et adnectit inventas fruges et frugum ipsarum repertores isdem nominibus, ut comicus sermo est Venerem sine Libero et Cere- re frigere.' On Persaeus, see Deichgräber, *Persaios* (1937), 926–931; Steinmetz, *Die Stoa* (1994), 555–557; Thrans, *Hellenistische Philosophen* (2001), 201–208; Erskine, *Between Philosophy and the Court* (2011), 177–194; Gourinat, *Persaios* (2012), 234–243. On the religious views of Prodicus, see chapter III 2 D.
- 51 Thraede, *Euhemerismus* (1966), 881 'die im Zuge der Synchronisation des Mittelmeerraums auch die Rezeption orientalischer Mythologie erlaubt.'
- 52 Hyg. *Fab.* 224; Aët. *Plac.* I 6, 15 (see n. 49).
- 53 E.g. Cic. *Nat. deor.* II 62 'Suscepit autem vita hominum consuetudoque communis, ut beneficiis excellentis viros in caelum fama ac voluntate tollerent. Hinc Hercules hinc Castor et Pollux hinc Asclepius hinc Liber ... quorum cum remanerent animi atque aeternitate fruerentur, rite di sunt habitū, cum et optimi essent et aeterni.'
- 54 See below Appendix I: Homines pro diis culti. Cf. Elter, *Donarem pateras* (1907), 40, 7 – 40, 9; Geffcken, *Zwei griechische Apologeten* (1907), 225–226; La Penna, *Brevi considerazioni sulla divinizzazione degli eroi* (1988), 275–287; Winiarczyk, *Wykazy 'homines pro diis culti'* (1999), 75–80.
- 55 See below Appendix II: Deos homines fuisse.

that is primarily the heavenly bodies, and the other included deified people (*immortales ex hominibus facti*).⁵⁶

Some scholars believed that the *Ἱερὰ Ἀναγραφὴ* had an influence on Persaeus,⁵⁷ but this view is wrong because Euhemerus and Stoics both drew on the concept of euergetism, which was already present in the poetry of Homer and known in the Classical period. Moreover, the benefactors Euhemerus had in mind were powerful kings whereas Prodicus and Persaeus referred to ‘culture heroes’.⁵⁸ Quite unfounded is the view of Jean Pépin that Euhemerus’ starting point was Stoic theology.⁵⁹ Also the chronology contradicts this hypothesis. I presume the Stoics would have viewed the *Ἱερὰ Ἀναγραφὴ* with approval since it supported their concept of the apotheosis of benefactors.⁶⁰

E. Euhemerism in historiography

a. Leon of Pella

In the Hellenistic period (3rd–2nd century BC) there emerged an apocryphal letter supposedly written by Alexander the Great to his mother Olympias in which the Macedonian ruler writes that an Egyptian priest called Leon had told him in great secrecy the Egyptian gods were deified people (FGrHist 659).⁶¹ F. Jacoby was wrong to surmise that Leon lived in the 4th

56 See Varro, *Ant. rer. div.* fr. 32 Cardauns ap. Serv. *Verg. Aen.* VIII 275 ‘Varro dicit deos alios esse qui ab initio certi et sempiterni sunt, alios qui immortales ex hominibus facti sunt.’ Cic. *Leg.* II 19 ‘Divos et eos qui caelestes semper habitati, colunt, et ollos, quos endo caelo merita locaverint.’ Cf. Cic. *Leg.* II 27; Euhem. (T 25) ap. Diod. VI 1, 1–2 = Eus. *Praep. ev.* II 2, 52–53; Diod. I 13, 1; III 9, 1; Philo Bybl. (F Gr Hist 790 F 1) ap. Eus. *Praep. ev.* I 9, 29. Cf. Tert. *Ad nat.* II 14 (*nativi et facti*). See Spoerri, *Späthellenistische Berichte* (1959), 196–198.

57 E.g. Hirzel, *Untersuchungen zu Cicero’s philosophischen Schriften* (1882), II, 76; Michaelis, *De origine indicis deorum cognominum* (1898), 64 with n. 4.

58 Parker, *Athenian Religion* (1996), 264, n. 34.

59 Pépin, *Mythe et allégorie* (1976), 148–149.

60 Thraede, *Euhemerismus* (1966), 881; Babut, *Plutarque et le stoïcisme* (1969), 463.

61 Min. Fel. *Oct.* 21, 3 (FGrHist 659 F 5) ‘Alexander ille Magnus Macedo insigni volumine ad matrem suam scripsit metu suae potestatis proditum sibi de diis hominibus a sacerdote secretum; illic Vulcanum facit omnium principem et postea Iovis gentem.’ Arnob. *Adv. nat.* IV 29 (T 2 b) ‘et possumus quidem hoc in loco omnis istos, nobis quos inducitis atque appellatis deos, homines fuisse monstrare vel Atragantino Euhemero replicato, cuius libellos Ennius, clarum ut fieret cunctis, sermonem in Italiam transtulit, vel Nicagora Cyprio vel Pellaeo Leone vel Cyrenensi Theodoro vel Hippone ac Diagora Meliis vel auctoribus aliis mille, qui scrupulosae diligentiae cura in lucem res abditas libertate ingenua protulerunt.’ Aug. *Civ. Dei* VIII 5 (T 2 a) ‘Quae Alexander Macedo scribit ad matrem sibi a magno antistite sacrorum Aegyptiorum quodam Leone patefacta, ubi non Picus et Faunus et Aeneas et Romulus vel

century and had influenced Euhemerus through the writings of Hecataeus of Abdera.⁶²

b. Mnaseas of Patara in Lycia

Mnaseas, presumably a student of Eratosthenes, was the author of the *Περί-πλους* or *Περιηγήσεις*, in which he discussed in geographical order (Europe, Asia, Libya) not only geographical problems but also myths as well as miraculous things and events (*θαυμάσια*). He gave the genealogies of local gods and associated them with tyrants and rulers.⁶³ Giovanna Vallauri defined Mnaseas' method as degenerated Euhemerism.⁶⁴ Pietro Cappelletto rightly stresses that Mnaseas was not a typical Euhemerist but concedes that Euhemerism may have had some influence on his writing.⁶⁵

c. Nicagoras of Cyprus

From Arnobius' account it transpires that Nicagoras was a supporter of Euhemerism and argued that the gods were deified people.⁶⁶ However, we know nothing about this person. Moreover, some scholars have suggested the name Nicagoras should really be Nicanor.⁶⁷ They came to this conclu-

etiam Hercules et Aesculapius et Liber Semela natus et Tyndaridae fratres et si quos alios ex mortalibus pro dis habent, sed ipsi etiam maiorum gentium di ... Iuppiter, Iuno, Saturnus, Vulcanus, Vesta et alii plurimi ... homines fuisse produntur.' Cf. Athenag. *Leg. pro Chr.* 28, 1 (F 2); Aug. *Civ. Dei* VIII 27 (F 6).

62 In chapter III 2 H I discuss this work in detail.

63 On Mnaseas, see Preller, *Mnaseas* (1864), 312–329; Susemihl, *Geschichte* (1891), I, 679–680; Laqueur, *Mnaseas*, (1932), 2250–2253; Fraser, *Ptolemaic Alexandria*, (1972), I, 524–525, I, 781–782; II, 456, n. 837; II, 755–756, n. 41–48; Cappelletto, *I frammenti di Mnasea* (2003), 13–39. Edition of the fragments: Cappelletto, *op. cit.*, 51–110. In fr. 31 (ap. Athen. VIII 37, 346 D) Mnaseas writes that Atargatis was a queen.

64 Vallauri, *Origine e diffusione* (1960), 35 'Si tratta qui in ogni caso di un evemerismo degenerato, i cui rapporti con la dottrina originaria sono piuttosto lontani.' Cf. Preller, *op. cit.*, 315 'Dazu kommt bei Mnaseas ... der crasseste Euhemerismus, den man sich nur denken mag.' Herter, *Xanthos* (1967), 1366 'des Euhemeristen Mnaseas'; Bar-Kochva, *The Image of the Jews* (2010), 215 'One can find in Mnaseas variations – indeed reversals – on the Euhemerist interpretation of the world of gods that began a century earlier.'

65 Cappelletto, *I frammenti* (2003), 37 'L'evemerismo può ben aver esercitato un'influenza significativa su un autore già portato allo scetticismo e alla razionalizzazione del mito, ma nei frammenti esso non è mai evidente in termini inequivocabili, mentre l'esegesi di Mnasea è più spesso accostabile a quella di tanti altri autori precedenti e successivi, che facevano dell'interpretazione razionalistica e della genealogia eponimica la prassi comune della ricerca storico-mitografica.'

66 Arnob. *Adv. nat.* IV 29 (text in n. 61).

67 Meursius, *Criticus Arnobianus* (1598), 136, identified Nicanor of Cyprus in Cl. Al. *Protr.* II 24, 2, with the Nicanor 'qui res gestas Alexandri Macedonis scripsit' (Lact. *Div.*

sion on the assumption that Arnobius took his list of authors from a work by Clement of Alexandria (*Protr.* II 24, 2) and altered Nicanor's name.⁶⁸ Despite the obvious similarities (Euhemerus' birthplace is Acragas), the two lists differ. Above all Clement does not mention Leon, while Arnobius adds information about Ennius' translation and states that he could present a more extensive history of deified gods. Therefore it seems more probable that Arnobius relied on some unknown source⁶⁹ or had extended and modified Clements' text.⁷⁰ In my opinion, there is no basis to change Arnobius' text.

d. Polybius

Polybius believed the gods were deified people who had made useful inventions.⁷¹ According to F. Susemihl, this historian relied on Euhemerus in his presentation of the origins of religion,⁷² but G. Vallauri rightly points out that we cannot speak of any direct influence.⁷³ Similarly to other historians, Polybius was merely applying the Euhemeristic method. His attitude to religion has been variously appraised by scholars, some have even quite wrongly accused him of atheism.⁷⁴

inst. I 6, 8) but offered no arguments to support his hypothesis. Apart from that, Clement mistakenly calls Hippo Μηλιος. Nevertheless Meursius' 'Nicanore Cyprio' conjecture was accepted by some editors (e.g. J.C. Orellius, Leipzig 1816) and later by Kroll, *Nikagoras* 7 (1936), 216; Gisinger, *Nikanor-Nikagoras* (1956), 363; Sitte, *Mythologische Quellen des Arnobius*, (1970), 11. On the other hand, it was rejected by the most recent editors of the *Adversus nationes* (A. Reifferscheid, Wien 1875 and C. Marchesi, Torino ²1953) as well as by Tullius, *Die Quellen des Arnobius* (1934), 98; Mora, *Arnobio* (1994), 66. It should be added that Lobeck, *Aglaophamus* (1829), 1000, and Pfister, *Ein apokrypher Alexanderbrief* (1964), 292, n. 3, assumed that Nicanor of Cyprus was one and the same as Nicanor in *Schol. Apoll. Rhod.* IV 262, but this view cannot be justified. Müller, FHG III 634 fr. 15, attributed this fragment to Nicanor of Alexandria.

68 Röhricht, *De Clemente Alexandrino* (1892), 23–24; Geffcken, *Zwei gr. Apologeten* (1907), 288; Rapisarda, *Clemente fonte di Arnobio* (1939), 54–55; Sitte, *op. cit.*, 1–20. Tullius, *op. cit.*, 96–98, tried to prove that Arnobius did not rely on Clement, but his basic assumption is wrong (Clement mentions ἄθεοι, and Arnobius θεοί).

69 Mora, *Arnobio* (1994), 67 'si può però ragionevolmente e con ogni probabilità ancor meglio pensare che l'elenco provenga ad Arnobio dalla stessa fonte, per noi persa e difficilmente precisabile.'

70 See e.g. Kroll, *Arnobiusstudien* (1917/18), 110 'sondern auch griechische Quellen wie Clemens geschickt benutzt und fast nirgends bloss kompiliert, sondern unter Verwendung aller möglichen Lesefrüchte kombiniert und kontaminiert.'

71 Polyb. XXXIV 2, 5 ap. Str. I 2, 15 p. 23–24. Among others, he mentions here Aeolus, who showed sailors the way through the Strait of Messina and was thus deemed to be a king and ruler of the winds. In *Hist.* X 10, 11 Polybius writes that in Carthage Aletes received ἰσόθεοι τιμαί for discovering veins of silver. See Pédech, *Les idées religieuses de Polybe* (1965), 42–58 ('L'existence des dieux').

72 Susemihl, *Geschichte* (1892), II, 102–103. Cf. Walbank, *Polybios* (1972), 60.

73 Vallauri, *Origine e diffusione* (1960), 22.

74 See works cited in Winarczyk, *Bibliographie* (1994), 81.

e. Apollodorus of Athens

Athenagoras stated that Apollodorus wrote about the *theologia dipertita* of the Egyptians.⁷⁵ Yet we cannot consider Apollodorus to have been an Euhemerist merely on the basis of the testimony of a Christian apologist who only had second-hand knowledge of the book *Περὶ θεῶν*.⁷⁶ Moreover, it is very difficult to say anything for certain about the nature of the work, since only a few fragments of it have survived.⁷⁷

f. Castor of Rhodes

Castor was the author of the chronological work the *Χρονικά*, comprising six books, which for the first time synchronised the histories of the East, Greece and Rome.⁷⁸ It began with the reign of king Belus of Assyria and ended in the year 61/60 BC, when Pompey the Great introduced important changes in the Near East. In ancient times this textbook was very popular and referred to by many authors, including Varro in his *De gente populi Romani* as well as Christian chronographers (Julius Africanus and Eusebius of Caesarea). In it we see an Euhemeristic influence because Castor writes that Belus of Assyria was later recognised as a god.⁷⁹

g. Diodorus Siculus

In books I–VI of his *Bibliotheca historica* Diodorus almost 70 times mentions that *εὐεργεσία* leads to apotheosis.⁸⁰ That is why there can be no doubt he was a supporter of Euhemerism. In book I he writes that the inhabitants of Egypt followed the *theologia dipertita* and interprets in the Euhemeristic

75 Apollod. FGrHist 244 F 104 ap. Athenag. *Leg. pro Chr.* 28, 4 καὶ ὅτι μὲν ἄνθρωποι, δηλοῦσιν μὲν καὶ Αἰγυπτίων οἱ λογιώτατοι, οἱ θεοὺς λέγοντες αἰθέρα, γῆν, ἥλιον, σελήνην, τοὺς ἄλλους ἀνθρώπους θνητοὺς νομίζουσιν καὶ ἱερὰ τοὺς τάφους αὐτῶν· δηλοὶ δὲ καὶ Ἀπολλόδορος ἐν τῷ περὶ θεῶν.

76 Geffcken, *Zwei gr. Apologeten* (1907), 225; Jacoby, *FGrHist II D* (1930), 767 ‘der inhalt des Athenagoraskapitels ist nicht A.’ Cf. Vallauri, *op. cit.*, 35.

77 An attempt to reconstruct the work in: Reinhardt, *De Graecorum theologia capita duo* (1910), 81–121, esp. 107 ff.; Jacoby, *op. cit.*, 753–775, 811–812 (commentary to 244 F 88–153, 352–356). Also see Zucker, *Spuren von Apollodoros’ Περὶ θεῶν* (1904).

78 On Castor, see e.g. Susemihl, *Geschichte* (1892), II, 365–372; Kubitschek, *Kastor* (1919), 2347–2357; Spoerri, *Kastor* (1969), 151–152. Edition: FGrHist 250.

79 Castor FGrHist 250 F 1 ap. Eus. *Chron. Arm.* p. 26 Karst (‘Belos ... schied aus dem Leben, der denn gar für einen Gott gehalten wurde’). Castor’s Euhemerism was pointed out to me by B. Garstad, CR 53, 2003, 311.

80 Thus Sacks, *Diodorus Siculus* (1990), 71, Diodorus willingly used the expression *τυχεῖν ἀθανάτων τιμῶν*. Cf. Sacks, *op. cit.*, 71, n. 82–83.

spirit an old Egyptian tradition according to which the first rulers of Egypt were gods. The priests of Heliopolis believed the first king of Egypt was Helios (Re-Atum), whereas according the Memphite tradition it was Hephaestus/Ptah.⁸¹ The reign of Dionysus/Osiris is particularly worthy of attention.⁸² He achieved many useful things, including the abolition of cannibalism (I, 14, 1), discovery of the grapevine and teaching the people to make wine (I, 15, 8). Moreover, he founded the city of Diospolis (Thebes) and built temples for his parents, Zeus and Hera, as well as two gold temples, the larger one for the heavenly Zeus and the smaller one for his father Zeus/Ammun (I 15, 3). Later Osiris organised a great expedition with the intention of encompassing the entire oikumene.⁸³ On the way he taught people to grow grapevines as well as harvest wheat and oats because he felt that for these benefactions he would receive divine honours.⁸⁴ He first travelled to Ethiopia, then to Arabia, thence along the Red Sea coast until he reached India and the borders of the oikumene. Osiris returned to Europe via the Hellespont and in Thrace he killed Lycurgus. Finally he returned to Egypt, where he received divine honours.⁸⁵ After his death, Isis and Hermes made offerings to him.⁸⁶ Next Diodorus recounts the history of Isis (I 21, 1 – 22, 7), who took over the reign after her husband was murdered by Typhon/Set. She demanded that the priests should worship Osiris as a god, reminding them of all the benefactions that ruler had performed.⁸⁷ When Isis died, she too was awarded divine honours,⁸⁸ for she had distinguished herself as a benign ruler. Diodorus also mentions the numerous inventions of Hermes/Thoth (I 15, 9 – 16, 2), who among other things established a cult of gods and the practice of laying offerings.⁸⁹ The last ruler of Egypt was the son of Osiris and Isis, Horus/Apollo, who performed many benefactions for people by healing them and founding oracles.⁹⁰ Above I have tried to demonstrate how

81 See Burton, *Diodorus Siculus* (1972), 71.

82 Diod. I 14, 1–15, 8; I 17, 1–20, 5. Schwartz, *Diodoros* (1905), 671, reckoned that Diodorus had used 'ein mythologisches Handbuch'.

83 See Bergman, *Ich bin Isis* (1968), 39, n. 3 'Bei Diod. Sic. ist das Motiv des ἐπελθεῖν ἅπασαν τὴν οἰκουμένην sehr oft zu belegen, z.B. I 17, 1; 20, 3; III 3, 1; 61, 1 und 4; 62, 2; 63, 4; 64, 6; 73, 6; 74, 2 und 4; IV 1, 7; 2, 5; 8, 5; 17, 3.' Cf. Pfister, *Der Reliquienkult* (1909), I, 164–166 and Sartori, *Storia* (1984), 498–501.

84 τιμῶν ἀθανάτων τεύξεται διὰ τὸ μέγεθος τῆς εὐεργεσίας (I 17, 2).

85 διὰ τὸ μέγεθος τῶν εὐεργεσιῶν συμπεφωνημένην λαβεῖν παρὰ πᾶσι τὴν ἀθανασία καὶ τὴν ἴσιν τοῖς οὐρανίοις τιμὴν (I 20, 5).

86 μετὰ δὲ ταῦτ' ἐξ ἀνθρώπων εἰς θεοὺς μεταστάντα τυχεῖν ὑπὸ Ἰσίδος καὶ Ἑρμοῦ θυσιῶν καὶ τῶν ἄλλων τῶν ἐπιφανεστάτων τιμῶν (I 20, 6).

87 καὶ τῶν εὐεργεσιῶν ὑπομνήσασαν παρακαλέσαι θάψαντας ἐν τοῖς ἰδίοις τόποις σῶμα τιμᾶν ὡς θεὸν τὸν Ὀσίριν (I 21, 6).

88 ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ ταύτην μεταστάσαν ἐξ ἀνθρώπων τυχεῖν ἀθανάτων τιμῶν καὶ ταφῆναι κατὰ τὴν Μέμφιν (I 22, 2).

89 καὶ τὰ περὶ τὰς τῶν θεῶν τιμὰς καὶ θυσίας διαταχθῆναι (I 16, 1).

90 διὰ τῶν χρησμών καὶ τῶν θεραπειῶν εὐεργετεῖν τὸ τῶν ἀνθρώπων γένος (I 25, 7).

wrong is the hypothesis that Diodorus' *theologoumena* (I 11–29) supposedly expressed the views of Hecataeus of Abdera.⁹¹ That is why I presume the parallels between Diodorus and the *Ἱερὰ Ἀναγραφή* in no way indicate Euhemerus reliance on Hecataeus.⁹² The information passed on by Diodorus is most probably typical for Hellenistic Euhemerism.

In book II Diodorus writes about the stay of Dionysus (II 38, 3–6) and Heracles (II 39, 1–4) in India. Dionysus invented many things useful for human existence, founded cities and transferred rural inhabitants to more appropriate places to live. He also gave people laws and taught them to worship gods. That is why he was considered a god and honoured as one.⁹³ Heracles freed India from land and sea monsters, founded cities and, after his death, was also recognised as a god.⁹⁴

Book IV speaks of the apotheosis of Dionysus after his return from India (IV 3, 2) and the deification of Heracles (IV 38–39). In IV 48 Glaucus foretells the apotheosis of Heracles and the Dioscuri, while towards its end (IV 81–82) the book relates the story of Aristaeus, the son of Apollo and the nymph Cyrene, who was recognised as a god thanks to his inventions.⁹⁵ Book V includes, in Euhemeristic spirit, an extensive account of the Cretan gods being inventors and benefactors (V 64–80).⁹⁶ Euhemeristic motifs may also be discerned in partially extant book VI.

h. Thallus

Thallus was the author of the chronographic work the *Ἱστορίαι*, in which he applied an Euhemeristic interpretation to Greek and Oriental history.⁹⁷ He wrote about the struggles of Belus, Cronus and the Titans against Zeus and

91 See chapter III 2 G.

92 The similarities are listed by Jacoby, *Euemerios* (1907), 969. In my edition of Euhemerus (pp. 54–55: Falsa 2a–c) I point to those passages of Diodorus' *Bibliotheca historica* which according to some scholars originate from Euhemerus' *Ἱερὰ Ἀναγραφή*.

93 καθόλου δὲ πολλῶν καὶ καλῶν ἔργων εἰσηγητὴν γενόμενον θεὸν νομισθῆναι καὶ τυχεῖν ἀθανάτων τιμῶν (II 38, 5 = Megasthenes FGrHist 715 F 42). See chapter VIII 1 H c.

94 καὶ τὸν μὲν Ἡρακλέα τὴν ἐξ ἀνθρώπων μετὰστασιν ποιησάμενον ἀθανάτου τυχεῖν τιμῆς (II 39, 4 = Megasthenes l. c.).

95 διὰ δὲ τὴν εὐχρηστίαν τὴν ἐκ τούτων τῶν εὐρημάτων τοὺς εὐεργετηθέντας ἀνθρώπους τιμῆσαι τὸν Ἀρισταῖον ἰσοθέοις τιμαῖς (IV 81, 3; cf. 81, 5; 81, 6).

96 E.g. divine honours for the Cretan Dactyls (V 64, 6) and the deification of Cronus (V 70, 1). According to Jacoby, *FGrHist III b* (1955), 341–342, the V 64–80 (=F Gr Hist 468 F 1) passage was derived from Laosthenidas, who in turn referred to the works of Epimenides, Dosiades and Sosicrates.

97 See Laqueur, *Thallos 1* (1934), 1225–1226; Jacoby, *FGrHist II D* (1930), 835–837; Holladay, *Fragments from Hellenistic Jewish Authors*. (1983), I, 343–369; Schürer, *The History of the Jewish People* (1986), III 1, 543–545.

considered them all to be humans.⁹⁸ Thallus was willingly cited by Christian authors, no doubt on account of the Euhemerism that appealed to them.⁹⁹

Thallus probably lived in the 1st century AD. Earlier scholars believed that he was a Samaritan. They assumed that the freedman of Emperor Tiberius referred to by Flavius Josephus in the *Antiquitates Iudaicae* (XVIII 6, 4) was our chronographer. He was supposed to combine Jewish tradition with Hellenistic syncretism.¹⁰⁰ However, it was correctly noted that this identification is based on very tenuous assumptions.¹⁰¹ We are therefore forced to conclude that we know nothing for certain about the life or even the nationality of Thallus.

i. Philo of Byblos

Philo († after 138 AD) was the author of the Φοινικικά or Φοινικική ιστορία,¹⁰² whose fragments are chiefly cited by Eusebius of Caesarea († c. 340) in his *Praeparatio evangelica*.¹⁰³ The Christian apologist cites the Φοινικική ιστορία to show that pagan gods were deified people. Philo stated that he had translated into Greek the work of the Phoenician Sanchuniathon, living before the Trojan war,¹⁰⁴ who in turn based his work on the writings of Taau-

98 FGrHist 256 F 2 ap. Theoph. *Ad Autol.* III 29 καὶ γὰρ Βήλου τοῦ Ἀσσυρίων βασιλεῦσαντος καὶ Κρόνου τοῦ Τιᾶνος Θάλλος μέμνηται, φάσκων τὸν Βῆλον πεπολεμηκέναι σὺν τοῖς Τιᾶσι πρὸς τὸν Δία καὶ τοὺς σὺν αὐτῷ θεοὺς λεγομένους.

99 Jacoby, *FGrHist II D* (1930), 835. Latin apologists referred to Thallus when they wished to state that Saturn was a human being: FGrHist 256 F 4a-c ap. Tert. *Apol.* 10; Lact. *Div. inst.* I 13, 8; Min. Fel. *Oct.* 23, 9 (=21, 4). In Tert. *Ad nat.* II 12, he is called 'Tacitus' but Schmidt, *Zu den Quellen der römischen Mythistorie* (1989), 100, n. 3, assumes that 'der Name Thallos in der Überlieferung ausgefallen ist.'

100 Wachsmuth, *Einleitung* (1895), 146–147. 'In seinem Werk waren hebräische Traditionen ... mit hellenistischen in üblichem Synkretismus gemischt.' Similarly e.g. Freudenthal, *Hellenistische Studien* (1874), I, 100–101; Laqueur, *Thallos* (1934), 1226; Schürer, *The History* (1986), III 1, 544, although he realises the uncertainty of this hypothesis. Hengel, *Judentum und Hellenismus* (1988), 164, is of the opinion that if not a Samaritan, Thallus was at least a Syrian. Täubler, *Der Chronograph Thallos* (1916), 572–574, tried to prove that the Thallus mentioned by Josephus was the private secretary of Augustus (Suet. *Aug.* 67, 2), but this hypothesis seems unlikely. See Schürer, *op. cit.*, 544–545, n. 59.

101 Jacoby, *FGrHist II D* (1930), 835–836; Stein, *Thallos* 5, (1934), 1227; Rigg, *Thallus: the Samaritan?* (1941), 111–119.

102 Porphyry (*De abst.* II 56, 1) relates that the work included eight books, but Eusebius (*Praep. ev.* I 9, 23) writes about nine books. An attempt to explain this discrepancy is made by Edwards, *Philo or Sanchuniathon?* (1991), 219. On the Phoenician History, see e.g. West, *Hesiod, Theogony* (1966), 24–28; Barr, *Philo of Byblos* (1974), 17–68; Troiani, *L'opera storiografica di Filone* (1974); Ebach, *Weltentstehung und Kulturentwicklung bei Philon* (1979); Baumgarten, *The Phoenician History of Philo* (1981); Baumgarten, *Heiliges Wort* (1998), 192–196.

103 Eus. *Praep. ev.* I 9, 20 – I 10, 53 = F Gr Hist 790 F 1–4.

104 See e.g. Loewenstamm, *Sanchuniathon* (1974), 593–598; Baumgarten, *The Phoenician History* (1981), 42–51; Dochhorn, *Porphyrius über Sanchuniathon* (2002),

tus, identified with the Egyptian god Thoth,¹⁰⁵ found by chance in the adyton of the temple of Ammon.¹⁰⁶ Philo's book included cosmogony and zoogony, accounts of the first inventors (πρῶτοι εὐρεταί) whose benefactions contributed to the emergence of civilization¹⁰⁷ as well as the tale of four generations of rulers who were deified after death.¹⁰⁸

Earlier scholars assumed Philo was referring to a fictitious author, but after the discoveries in Ras Shamra (starting in 1929), it was realised that he might have really had access to ancient Phoenician sources, since his names of gods also appear in the Ugaritic texts. Eventually, however, the thesis that the account dated back to the second millennium was rejected. Most scholars currently assume that Sanchuniathon passed on the Phoenician materials from the first half of the first millennium.¹⁰⁹ Scholars point to the fact that the name Sanchuniathon is first testified around the year 700.¹¹⁰

The author of the Φοινικικὴ ἱστορία willingly applies the Euhemeristic interpretation. He believed that the gods were people deified on account of their benefactions. He also believed that the Phoenicians were supporters of the *theologia dipertita*.¹¹¹ Moreover, he wrote that Cronus travelled

121–145. All attempts at dating are subjective. second half of 2nd millennium: Eissfeldt, *Taautos und Sanchuniathon* (1952), 70; *idem*, *Sanchuniathon* (1961), 1361 'um die Mitte des 2. Jt.s v. Chr.'; 9th century.: Rölig, *Sanchuniathon* (1972), 1539; no later than 7th century: Eissfeldt, *Ras Shamra und Sanchuniathon* (1939), 67–71; second quarter of 6th century: Albright, *Yahveh and the Gods of Canaan* (1969), 195. See n. 113 below. On the etymology of the Phoenician name Σαγχουνιάθων or Σαγχουνιάθων ('Sakkun gave'), see Baumgarten, *The Phoenician History* (1981), 42–43; West, *Orpheus, Sanchuniathon*, (1994), 294 with n. 20.

105 Eus. *Praep. ev.* I 10, 14 (F 2) ἀπὸ Μισώρ ὁ Τάαντος, ὃς εὗρεν τὴν τῶν πρώτων στοιχείων γραφὴν· ὃν Αἰγύπτιοι μὲν Θωύθ, Ἀλεξανδρεῖς δὲ Θώθ, Ἕλληνες δὲ Ἑρμῆν ἐκάλεσαν. Cf. Eus. *Praep. ev.* I 9, 24 (F 1). On the identification of Taautos with Thoth see e.g. Baumgarten, *op. cit.*, 68–72; Ribichini, *Taautos* (1991), 201–213; Fowden, *The Egyptian Hermes* (1993), 216–217. Eusebius, however, writes elsewhere (*Praep. ev.* I 9, 21) that Sanchuniathon relied on a book by the priest Hierombalus and ἐκ τῶν κατὰ πόλιν ὑπομνημάτων καὶ τῶν ἐν τοῖς ἱεροῖς ἀναγραφῶν. This version is based on the account of Porphyry (FGrHist 260 F 34). On Eusebius' sources, see Baumgarten, *op. cit.*, 88–91, cf. 41 ff. and Edwards, Philo (1991), 219.

106 Eus. *Praep. ev.* I 9, 24 = F 1.

107 Eus. *Praep. ev.* I 10, 9–14.

108 See Eus. *Praep. ev.* I 10, 15 ὁ Ὑψιστος ... τελευτήσας ἀφιερῶθη, ᾧ χοὰς καὶ θυσίας παῖδες ἐτέλεσαν. The apotheosis of the younger sons of Cronus and Rhea in Eus. *Praep. ev.* I 10, 24, and Uranus in I 10, 29. On the term ἀφιέρωσις, see Baumgarten, *The Phoenician History* (1981), 204–205. On the Phoenician succession myth see Schwabl, *Weltschöpfung* (1962), 1487–1489; West, *The East Face of Helicon* (1997), 284–286.

109 Forschungsbericht in: Ebach, *Weltentstehung* (1979), 4–17; Attridge, Oden, *Philo of Byblos* (1981), 3–9; Baumgarten, *op. cit.*, 1–6.

110 Nautin, *Sanchuniathon chez Philon* (1949), 272; West, *Orpheus* (1994), 294, n. 20.

111 Eus. *Praep. ev.* I 9, 29 οἱ παλαιάτατοι τῶν βαρβάρων, ἐξαίρετως δὲ Φοινικὲς τε καὶ Αἰγύπτιοι, παρ' ὧν καὶ οἱ λοιποὶ παρέλαβον ἀνθρώποι, θεοὺς ἐνόμιζον μεγίστους

around the oikumene and entrusted the rule of Attica to his daughter Athena.¹¹² Some scholars presumed that the *Kulturheroengenealogie* was already present in Sanchuniathon's work. Jürgen Ebach believed that Euhemerism really existed in the ancient East,¹¹³ but added that it does not appear in the Phoenician text as a theory regarding origins of belief in gods.¹¹⁴ More probable to me seems the view that Philo was inspired by Hellenistic historiography, from which he adopted not only Euhemerism but also the concept of universal history, the national perspective and the motif of discovering in a temple a stele or book.¹¹⁵ That is why, in my opinion, Euhemeristic views were not present in Sanchuniathon's work but were later added by Philo.¹¹⁶ Nevertheless, I consider the question of whether Philo adapted an ancient source in the Euhemeristic spirit or simply compiled various themes from the Hellenistic period to be open.¹¹⁷

τοὺς τὰ πρὸς τὴν βιωτικὴν χρεῖαν εὐρόντας ἢ καὶ κατὰ τι εὖ ποιήσαντας τὰ ἔθνη· εὐεργέτας τε τούτους καὶ πολλῶν αἰτίους ἀγαθῶν ἡγοῦμενοι ὡς θεοὺς προσεκύνουν, καὶ εἰς τὸ χρεῶν μεταστάντας ναοὺς κατασκευασάμενοι στήλας τε καὶ ῥάβδους ἀφιέρουν ἐξ ὀνόματος αὐτῶν, καὶ ταῦτα μεγάλως σεβόμενοι καὶ ἑορτὰς ἔνεμον αὐτοῖς τὰς μεγίστας Φοίνικες, ἐξαιρέτως δὲ καὶ ἀπὸ τῶν σφετέρων βασιλέων τοῖς κοσμικοῖς στοιχείοις καὶ τισι τῶν νομιζομένων θεῶν τὰς ὀνομασίας ἐπέθεσαν· φυσικοὺς δὲ ἥλιον καὶ σελήνην καὶ τοὺς λοιποὺς πλανήτας ἀστέρας καὶ τὰ στοιχεῖα καὶ τὰ τούτοις συναφῇ θεοὺς μόνους ἐγίνωσκον, ὥστ' αὐτοῖς τοὺς μὲν θνητοὺς τοὺς δὲ ἀθανάτους θεοὺς εἶναι. Cf. Theodor. Graec. affect. cur. III 25. On the Euhemerism of Philo, see Clemen, *Die phönikische Religion* (1939), 58–77; Eissfeldt, *Ras Schamra* (1939), 75–95; Brown, *Euhemerus* (1946), 271–274; Eissfeldt, *Tautos* (1952), 34–50; Vallauri, *Origine* (1960), 32–34; Troiani, *L'opera storiografica* (1974), 42–51; Ebach, *Weltentstehung* (1979), 393–408; Baumgarten, *The Phoenician History* (1981), 80–82, 242–243, 262–263.

112 Eus. *Praep. ev.* I 10, 32 = F 2.

113 Ebach, *Weltentstehung* (1979), 404: Euhemerism was 'dem Material nach tatsächlich eine Anschauung des alten Orients.' Similarly Baudissin, *Sanchuniathon* (1906), 462–463 (p. 463: Euhemerios 'soll sein System von den Sidoniern entnommen haben'); Clemen, *Die phönikische Religion* (1939), 75–76; Mras, *Sanchuniathon* (1952), 179–180; Troiani, *L'opera storiografica* (1974), 45–46. Cf. Ebach, *op. cit.*, 407–408: The *Kulturheroengenealogie* emerged in the 9th–6th centuries and encompassed the lifetime of Sanchuniathon, whom 'man sich ... nicht als originären Schriftsteller, sondern als Bearbeiter und Kompositor sehr viel älterer Traditionen vorstellen muß.'

114 Ebach, *op. cit.*, 404.

115 Oden, *Philo of Byblos* (1978), 115–126, esp. 118 ff. Similarly Fornaro, *Herenmnios Philon* (1998), 410. Also see Edwards, *Philo* (1991), 213.

116 E.g. Brown, *Euhemerus* (1946), 273, and Vallauri, *Origine* (1960), 33. See n. 117 below.

117 Thus Attridge, Oden, *Philo* (1981), 8. Also see Kirk, Raven, Schofield, *The Presocratic Philosophers* (1983), 41. Baumgarten, *The Phoenician History* (1981), 80–82, 242–243, points to certain similarities between the works of Euhemerus, Dionysius, Scytobrachion and Philo and comes to the somewhat far-fetched conclusion that 'the Euhemeristic school had certain historiographic commonplaces or canons' (p. 82). On the other hand, it seems that some of the similarities may be explained differently. For example, the discovery of a stele in a temple was a topos willingly used in

j. Sisyphus of Cos

Sisyphus was considered the author of a novel about the Trojan War (perhaps Τρωικά), which he based on the Ἐφημερίς τοῦ Τρωικοῦ πολέμου by Dictys of Knossos (1st century AD). Although fragments of this work (FGrHist 49) were first cited by John Malalas (6th century AD), F. Jacoby presumed this did not necessarily mean the original was written so late.¹¹⁸ Among other things, Sisyphus writes about the adventures of Odysseus on the island of Circe.¹¹⁹ In his work Aeolus, Circe and Calypso as well as the daughters of Atlas are presented not as deities but as rulers. That is why Fritz Taeger included him among the Euhemerists.¹²⁰

F. Latin Euhemerists

Several Christian writers maintain that Saturn was a deified human.¹²¹ They refer to Cassius and Cornelius Nepos, whereas Lactantius also mentions Varro. Peter Lebrecht Schmidt believes that the Church Fathers read Suetonius' *De regibus*, which was based on a work by Verrius Flaccus, who in turn relied on Varro.¹²² Moreover, Schmidt believes that Cassius was the annalist Cassius Hemina (2nd century BC).¹²³ Schmidt's arguments have

the Hellenistic period and during the Roman Empire by writers who had nothing to do with Euhemerism. See chapter V 2 B.

118 Jacoby, *FGrHist I a* (1957), 530.

119 FGrHist 50 F 3.

120 Taeger, *Charisma* (1960), I, 385 with n. 49.

121 Tert. *Ad nat.* II 12 'exstat apud litteras vestras usquequaque Saturni census: legimus apud Cassium Severum, apud Cornelios Nepotem et Tacitum, apud Graecos quoque Diodorum, quique alii antiquitatum canos collegerunt.' Tert. *Apol.* 10, 7 'Saturnum itaque, si quantum litterae docent, neque Diodorus Graecus aut Thallus neque Cassius Severus aut Cornelius Nepos neque ullus commentator eiusmodi antiquitatum aliud quam hominem promulgaverunt.' Min. Fel. *Oct.* 23, 9 'Saturnum enim, principem huius generis et examinis, omnes scriptores vetustatis Graeci Romanique hominem prodiderunt. scit hoc Nepos et Cassius in historia, et Thallus ac Diodorus hoc loquuntur.' Lact. *Div. inst.* I 13, 8 'omnes ergo non tantum poetae, sed historiarum quoque ac rerum antiquarum scriptores hominem (scil. Saturnum) fuisse consentiunt, qui res eius in Italia gestas memoriae prodiderunt, Graeci Diodorus et Thallus, Latini Nepos et Cassius et Varro.' See n. 99 above.

122 Schmidt, *Das Corpus Aurelianum* (1978), 1632–1633; *idem*, *Zu den Quellen* (1989), 99–105, esp. 102 ff.; *idem*, *Historiographie*, (1989), 185. A common source for Tertullian, Minucius Felix and Lactantius was previously accepted by Wilhelm, *De Minucii Felicis Octavio et Tertulliani Apologetico* (1887), 40 ff., and Agahd, *M. Terenti Varronis Antiquitatum Rerum Divinarum libri* (1898), 39–71, esp. 50 ff.

123 Schmidt, *Zu den Quellen* (1989), 101, considers wrong the 'Cassius Severus' form in Tert. *Apol.* 10, 7, because Min. Fel. *Oct.* 23, 9 writes 'Cassius in historia'. Wifstrand Schiebe, *The Saturn of the Aeneid* (1986), 45, n. 7, was of the opinion that we

been thoroughly analysed and decidedly rejected by Marianne Wifstrand Schiebe.¹²⁴ She is of the opinion that in the Roman Republic there existed two independent traditions. There was a legend that the god Saturn ruled in Italy not after his expulsion but before Jupiter's reign. Another tradition had it that initially Italy or part of Italy was called Saturnia, and the Capitol was called Saturnius. Vergil was the first to relate the story of Saturn escaping to Italy,¹²⁵ and his reign there beginning a golden age.¹²⁶ This poet's concept was historically interpreted by Hyginus, a freedman of Augustus and the head of the library on the Palatine.¹²⁷ A similar historical approach, also during the reign of Augustus, was adopted by Pompeius Trogus in his work the *Historiae Philippicae*, about which we know from Justin's epitome (XLIII 1) written before 226. These authors clearly wrote about the reign of a historical king but the details of their accounts differ considerably. Later, in the 4th century, the author of the *Origo gentis Romanae* (OGR) applied an Euhemeristic interpretation of the story of Janus and Saturn.¹²⁸ Servius, the 4th-century author of a commentary to Virgil's poetry, believed that the gods Saturn and Jupiter were eternal forces existing in the cosmos which had nothing to do with the mortal kings Saturn and Jupiter.¹²⁹ However, the so-called *Servius auctus* or *Scholia Danielis*, i.e. the extended version of the commentary from probably the 7th century,¹³⁰ contains an Euhemeristic interpretation of Saturn¹³¹ which is not consistent with Servius' original version. Although Hyginus, Pompeius Trogus as well as the authors of the

have no way of knowing which Cassius was being referred to and even doubted the Latin writers 'had any clear idea about whom they meant.' She, nevertheless, later modified her views in *Vergil* (1997), 24–25, n. 34, believing that Minucius deliberately altered Tertullian's text, realising that Cassius Severus was not a historian. From this we deduce that Minucius had Cassius Hemina in mind. This is a view also held by Chassignet, *Étiologie, étymologie* (1998), 334.

124 Wifstrand Schiebe, *Vergil* (1997), 19–28, 115–119. There she rejects Schmidt's hypothesis that Suetonius' *De regibus* was a source of the Latin authors.

125 I nevertheless think Saturn's escape to Italy may have already been written about by Ennius in *Euhemerus sive Sacra historia* (T 58 ap. Lact. *Div. inst.* I 14, 11–12). See chapter VII 4, n. 51.

126 Verg. *Aen.* VI 792 ff.; VIII 314 ff.; cf. VII 45 ff.

127 Hyginus fr. 6 Peter (HRR II 73–74) = fr. 17 Funaioli (GRF p. 535) ap. Macrobi. *Sat.* I 7, 24.

128 Wifstrand Schiebe, *Vergil* (1997), 119–131, rejects Schmidt's view (*Das Corpus Aurelianum* [1978], 1612 ff.; *Historiographie* [1989], 185) that the author of the OGR relied on Verrius Flaccus' *Res memoria dignae*.

129 According to Wifstrand Schiebe, *op. cit.*, 131–139.

130 Thilo, *Servii Grammatici qui feruntur in Vergilii Carmina commentarii* (1881), LXVII–LXIX; Schmidt, *Grammatik und Rhetorik* (1989), 150–151.

131 Jones, *Allegorical Interpretation in Servius* (1960/61), 226, enumerates many places in Servius' commentary which he defines as 'Euhemeristic', but Wifstrand Schiebe, *Vergil* (1997), 133 n. 78, writes that Jones 'scheint jede Art von Rationalismus als Euhemerismus zu bezeichnen'. We should add that Jones, *op. cit.*, 221–222, is wrong

OGR and *Servius auctus* all write about Saturn being a human being, they are not typical Euhemerists because they do not regard Jupiter to be a deified person.¹³²

Lactantius writes in the *Divinae institutiones* (I 13, 8) that Varro († 27 BC) considered Saturn to be a human. The most recent editors of fragments of Varro's *Antiquitates rerum divinarum* have not included this testimony.¹³³ M. Wifstrand Schiebe¹³⁴ convincingly argues that Varro applied a cosmological and allegorical interpretation that ruled out the human origin of gods and the possibility of deities appearing in human form.¹³⁵ That is why she is of the opinion that Lactantius simply added Varro's name to the text. Nevertheless, Varro did know the Euhemeristic interpretation of gods since he had read Ennius' *Euhemerus sive Sacra historia* (T 83). We also know that in the *Chronica* (fr. 1 Peter = fr. 3 Marshall), which were written before 54 BC, Cornelius Nepos considered Saturn to have been a human. The extent to which Euhemerism was known in Roman society is arguable. Fritz Graf's opinion that Euhemerism was never very popular in the ancient world seems probable.¹³⁶

G. *Index deorum cognominum*

The academic Velleius criticised Stoic theology in book III of Cicero's *De natura deorum*. Passage III 53–60, which constitutes a separate whole, begins as follows: 'Dicamus igitur Balbe oportet contra illos etiam, qui hos

to include among the Euhemerists Palaphaetus, who interpreted Greek myths rationally.

132 Cf. Wifstrand Schiebe, *op.cit.*, 130–131.

133 Agahd, *M. Terenti Varronis* (1898), and Cardauns, *M. Terentius Varro* (1976).

134 Wifstrand Schiebe, *Lactanz und Varro* (1994), 162–186. Cf. Agahd, *op. cit.*, 54 'fac illum (scil. Varronem) in antiquitatibus Rer. Hum. vel in alio libro Saturni gesta Euhemeri rationem secutum exposuisse; in libro Rer. Div. XVI hoc eum fecisse aut facere potuisse nego. Nam, ut supra (p. 45) iam diximus, in hoc libro totum se praestitit philosophum eumque stoicum, atque ipse Augustinus C. D. VII 19, postquam nonnullarum de Saturno fabularum interpretationes physicas examinavit, expressis verbis pronuntiat: Haec et alia de Saturno multa dicuntur (scil. a Varrone in R. D. libro XVI) et ad semen omnia referuntur.'

135 Wifstrand Schiebe, *Lactanz* (1994), 183–184 'die kosmisch-allegorische, mit semen/semina verbundene Deutung, die sowohl den menschlichen Ursprung der so gedeuteten Götter wie ihr Auftreten in menschlicher Gestalt ausschließt.' On Varro's theology, see e.g. Boyancé, *Sur la théologie de Varron* (1955), 57–84, reprint in *idem, Etudes sur la religion romaine*, (1972), 253–282; Pépin, *Mythe et allégorie* (1976), 13–32, 276–392; Cardauns, *Varro und die römische Religion* (1978), 80–103; Lehmann, *Varron théologien* (1997), esp. 157–262.

136 Graf, *Römische Aitia* (1992), 16 'zu keiner Zeit ... in der Antike das euhemeristische Denkmodell populär gewesen ist.'

deos ex hominum genere in caelum translato non re sed opinione esse dicunt, quos auguste omnes sancteque veneramus.¹³⁷ Next Velleius cites and criticises the *Index deorum cognominum*,¹³⁸ which mentions 3 Ioves, 3 types of Dioscuri and Muses, 5 Sols, 3 Vulcani, 5 Mercuries, 3 Aesculapii, 4 Apollos, 3 Dianae, 5 Dionysi, 4 Veneres, 5 Minervae and 3 Cupidines. Many earlier scholars believed that the author of the *Index deorum cognominum* was an Euhemerist.¹³⁹ They referred to the above statement and to other distinctly Euhemeristic elements,¹⁴⁰ such as gods as kings¹⁴¹ or the tombs of gods.¹⁴² Yet Cicero himself begins the *Index* by referring not to Euhemerus but to *ii qui theologi*¹⁴³ *nominantur*, who gathered information *ex vetere Graeciae fama*.¹⁴⁴ Instead of criticising Euhemerism, there follows a listing of cults where the name of the deity is the same but the cult location and genealogy are different.¹⁴⁵ That is why, in my opinion, passage III 53–60 criticises pluralistic theory and not Euhemerism.¹⁴⁶ Some scholars have presumed that Cicero intended to attack Euhemerism but in haste cited the wrong excerpt before sending his work to Atticus.¹⁴⁷ An even less plausible

137 Cf. Cic. *Nat. deor.* III 42; III 60.

138 The *Index deorum cognominum* is also cited by Cl. Al. *Protr.* II 28, 1–29, 1; Arnob. *Adv. nat.* IV 14–15; Firm. Mat. *De errore* 15, 5–16, 2; Ampel. *Lib. mem.* 9, 1–12; Serv. *Verg. Aen.* I 297; IV 577; Lyd. *De mens.* IV 51. 64. 67. 71. 86. 142; Lact. *Plac. Schol. Stat. Theb.* IV 481–483. The texts were compiled by Michaelis, *De origine* (1898), 70–77 and Bobeth, *De indicibus deorum*, (1904), 59–79. On the *Index*, see Hirzel, *Die Homonymie der griechischen Götter* (1896), 277–377; Michaelis, *loc. cit.*; Bobeth, *loc. cit.*; Rapisarda, *Clemente* (1939), 56–61 (Arnobius relied on Cicero and Clement); Girard, *Probabilisme, théologie et religion* (1983), 117–126.

139 E.g. de Block, *Evhémère* (1876), 122–123; Mayor, *De natura deorum* (1885), 201; Gruppe, *Die griechischen Culte* (1887), 18–19; Crusius, *Akantho*, (1884–1886), 207; Kremmer, *De catalogis heurematum*, (1890), 5; Michaelis, *op. cit.*, 59–68.

140 Hirzel, *Die Homonymie* (1896), 279.

141 The oldest Jupiter was the king of Athens (III 53), and the third Dionysus ruled in Asia (III 58).

142 The tomb of the third Jupiter on Crete (III 53), the second Asclepius in Cynosura (III 57) and the third Asclepius in Arcadia (III 57).

143 Pease, *De natura deorum* (1958), II, 1094 cites texts in which the words *theologi* and *θεολόγοι* appear.

144 See Cic. *Nat. deor.* III 42 ‘pluris enim tradunt nobis i qui interiores scrutantur et reconditas litteras ... nam Ioves quoque pluris in priscis Graecorum litteris invenimus.’ Cf. Arnob. *Adv. nat.* IV 14 ‘aiunt igitur theologi vestri et vetustatis absconditae conditores.’ On the *theologi* and theology, see Kattenbusch, *Die Entstehung einer christlichen Theologie* (1930), esp. 162–173; Ziehen, *θεολόγος*, (1934), 2031–2033; Festugière, *La Révélation d’Hermès Trismégiste*, (1950), II, 598–605; Jaeger, *Die Theologie* (1953), 12–19, 220–223.

145 Gigon, Straume-Zimmermann, *M. Tullius Cicero*, (1996), 560.

146 Similarly Hirzel, *Die Homonymie* (1896), 279 ff.; Jacoby, *Euemeros* (1907), 971; Solmsen, *Cicero De natura deorum* III 53 ff. (1944), 44–47; Pease, *De natura deorum* (1958), II, 1092; Gigon, Straume-Zimmermann, *op. cit.*, 566.

147 Solmsen, *op. cit.*, 47; Pease, *loc. cit.*

hypothesis is that Cicero wrote a criticism of Euhemerism but the text that followed the opening sentence was lost in the manuscripts.¹⁴⁸

Scholars have also tried to establish where and when the *Index deorum cognominum* was written. Leopold Reinhardt believed it originated from Alexandria,¹⁴⁹ whereas Rudolf Hirzel thought it was Athens.¹⁵⁰ Wilhelm Michaelis had in mind a Peripatetic who lived on Rhodes in the 2nd century BC,¹⁵¹ while Walter Bobeth assumed the Greek archetype was written in the 1st century BC and influenced later authors through Varro's *Antiquitates rerum divinarum* and Aristotle's *Περὶ θεογονίας*.¹⁵² In my opinion, the *Index* originates from the Hellenistic period but we cannot say exactly when and who wrote it.

H. Pseudo-Euhemerists

a. Diagoras of Melos

Some scholars believed Diagoras of Melos (5th century BC) was a supporter of Euhemerism.¹⁵³ In his work the *Φρύγιοι λόγοι* he was supposed to state that the gods were defied humans.¹⁵⁴ In the past I have tried to show that

148 Rackham, *De natura deorum* (1931), 336 and Pease, *loc. cit.*

149 Reinhardt, *Die Quellen von Ciceros Schrift De natura deorum*, 1888, 63 'Das Verzeichnis trägt vielmehr den Charakter alexandrinischen Sammelfleisses.' This hypothesis was rejected by Hirzel, *Die Homonymie* (1896), 321, because, in his opinion, there was little evidence of an Egyptian influence in the *Index*. On the other hand, van den Bruwaene, *Traces de mythologie égyptienne* (1979), 368–412, sees a considerable Egyptian influence 'car dans les sept paragraphes les Égyptiennes reviennent neuf fois.' (p. 369).

150 Hirzel, *op. cit.*, 330–334.

151 Michaelis, *De origine* (1898), 59–68. This hypothesis was accepted by Reitzenstein, *Poimandres* (1904), 164 and Wilamowitz-Moellendorf, *Der Glaube der Hellenen*, (1932), II, 420.

152 Bobeth, *De indicibus* (1904), 57 (stemma auctorum). This hypothesis was accepted by Pfister, *Der Reliquienkult* (1909), I, 392, and Heitsch, *Die Entdeckung der Homonymie*, (1972), 8, n. 2. Jacoby, *FGrHist Ia* (1957), 517–518, however, rejected 'die gleichsetzung des mythographen mit dem grammatiker Aristokles von Rhodos aus strabonischer zeit' and assumed that the author of the *Theogony* lived in the 3rd century BC.

153 On Diagoras, see above chapter VIII 1 C, n. 43.

154 Lobeck, *Aglaophamus* (1829), 370–371 'Diagoram in Sermonibus Phrygiis res gestas deorum sic, ut postea fecit Euhemerus, ad historiam revocasse.'; de Block, *Evhémère* (1876), 66–67; Gruppe, *Die griechischen Culte* (1887), 17; Gomperz, *Griechische Denker* (1922), I, 482, considered Diagoras a precursor (Vorläufer) of Euhemerism; de Vries, *Forschungsgeschichte der Mythologie* (1961), 29, believed Diagoras was a supporter (Nachfolger) of Euhemerus, which is quite impossible for chronological reasons.

Diagoras was not the author of a prose work criticising gods. It was only in the first half of the 4th century, after his death, that a sophist attributed to him the *Ἀποπυργίζοντες λόγοι* treatise. When in the Hellenistic period this work disappeared, the *Φρύγιοι λόγοι* were edited under his name and this work included Euhemeristic views that in certain circles were considered impious.¹⁵⁵ That is why, in my opinion, one cannot call Diagoras a precursor of Euhemerism.

b. Palaephatus

Palaephatus, a Peripatetic from the 4th century BC, was the author of the *Περὶ ἀπίστων*, in which he gave rationalistic interpretations to myths.¹⁵⁶ Only a few scholars reckoned that he was an Euhemerist.¹⁵⁷ This is a quite unfounded assumption because Euhemerism should not be confused with rationalistic interpretation of myths.¹⁵⁸

c. Megasthenes

Diodorus Siculus' account of the deeds and deification of Dionysus and Heracles in India originates from Megasthenes' *Ἰνδικά*.¹⁵⁹ Nevertheless, it seems that Diodorus may have altered the accepted tradition to emphasise the civilizational activities of the mythological heroes which led to their apotheosis.¹⁶⁰ Kenneth S. Sacks noted that Arrian, who also relied on Megasthenes, wrote of the god Dionysus inclining the inhabitants of India to worship him as a deity.¹⁶¹ Even if we consider Diodorus' account to be reliable, it would still concern a story of the apotheosis of heroes that was known to Greeks already in the Archaic period.¹⁶² Moreover, we cannot rule out that Megasthenes wrote the *Ἰνδικά* before Euhemerus wrote his work.¹⁶³ There-

155 Winiarczyk, *Diagoras* (1980), 51–75.

156 On Palaephatus, see chapter III 2 C.

157 Schrader, *Palaephatea* (1894), 50–58 ('De Palaephato Aristotelis discipulo'); Michaelis, *De origine* (1898), 65–66; Jones, *Allegorical Interpretation* (1960/61), 221–222.

158 See chapter VIII 1 A, n. 5.

159 Megasth. FGrHist 715 F 4 ap. Diod. II 38–39.

160 Sacks, *Diodorus* (1990), 72 'may well have reshaped much of the traditions he used, emphasizing that civilizing gifts also earned mythological characters theirs immortality.' Cf. Stein, *Megasthenes* (1931), 254, 256. A different opinion is held by Vallauri, *Origine* (1960), 28 'però non è assolutamente necessario ricorrere a tale ipotesi.'

161 Megasth. 715 F 12 ap. Arrian. *Ind.* 7, 8.

162 See chapter III 2 A a.

163 Bosworth, *The Historical Setting* (1996), 113–127, tried to prove that Megasthenes was an envoy to India c. 319/318 and wrote the *Ἰνδικά* c. 310. See chapter II 4 B, n. 38.

fore the view held by some scholars that Megasthenes was a supporter of Euhemerism is not so convincing to me.¹⁶⁴

d. Philochorus of Athens

According to some scholars the attidographer Philochorus († 267/261 BC) was a supporter of Euhemerism¹⁶⁵ because, among other things, he wrote that Cecrops founded the cult of Cronus and Rhea in Attica.¹⁶⁶ From Macrobius' text, however, does not follow that Cronus was a man deified by Cecrops. Likewise other passages cited by Fritz Taeger (F 13, 28, 46) and Jan de Vries (F 10, 14, 28, 38–40, 46) do not contain Euhemeristic interpretations. Instead we are dealing with merely rationalistic attempts to explain myths.¹⁶⁷

e. *Res gestae Divi Augusti*

Ulrich von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff (1848–1931) put forward the hypothesis that Augustus wrote the *Res gestae* (RG),¹⁶⁸ in which he enumerated his services to Rome as justification for his eventual apotheosis after death.¹⁶⁹ This was rejected by Theodor Mommsen (1817–1903), and his appraisal henceforth became *opinio communis* among scholars. Then the issue was analysed in detail by A.B. Bosworth,¹⁷⁰ who stated: 'Both Wilamowitz and Mommsen can be held to be justified,' (p. 13). Formally, the RG is indeed simply a report on the emperor's activities, but according to Bosworth one may also discern a few allusions to Ennius' *Euhemerus sive Sacra historia*.¹⁷¹

164 Supporters of this view include: Nestle, *Griechische Geistesgeschichte* (1956), 426–427; Taeger, *Charisma* (1957), I, 385 with n. 47; de Vries, *Forschungsgeschichte* (1961), 30–31.

165 Taeger, *op. cit.*, 385 with n. 51; de Vries, *op. cit.*, 30. Cf. Wifstrand Schiebe, *Vergil* (1997), 142, n. 121 'Es lässt sich vielleicht nicht ausschließen, dass Philochoros Kronos als ehemaligen Menschen betrachtete.'

166 Philochor. 328 F 97 ap. Macrobi. *Sat.* I 10, 22 'Philochoros Saturno et Opi primum in Attica statuissē aram Cecropem dicit eosque deos pro Iove Terraque coluisse.'

167 Cf. Jacoby, *FGrHist III b (suppl.) I* (1954), 547 'one of many rationalistic explanations of the Homeric monsters (ad F 174).'

168 The most recent editions of the RG are: Scheid (2007) and Cooley (2009). On the RG, see introductions to these editions and Ramage, *The Nature* (1987).

169 Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, *Res gestae* (1886), 625, reprint in *idem, Kleine Schriften*, V 1 (1971), 269 'Kurz und knapp, klar und wahr spricht er es aus, womit er sich den Himmel verdient zu haben glaubt'.

170 Bosworth, *Augustus, The Res Gestae* (1999), 1–18, esp. 10 ff.

171 Bosworth's arguments were accepted by Cooley, *Res Gestae* (2009), 41. 131. 144. 249.

- a) Panchaeon Zeus recorded his achievements on a stele,¹⁷²
- b) Zeus set an example for others to follow,¹⁷³
- c) Zeus created a world empire peacefully, by establishing friendly relations with local rulers who raised temples in his honour to preserve memory of his visit,¹⁷⁴
- d) Zeus, as ruler of the oikumene, performed benefactions for his subjects,¹⁷⁵
- e) there are linguistic similarities between the RG and Ennius' translation (though Bosworth does not give any examples).

Bosworth appreciates that the parallels he cites 'mean little' but adds that 'it is the cumulative weight of analogy that matters' (p. 16). He stresses that Ennius' *Euhemerus* was only one of many sources to the RG (p. 16) and refers to a number of other possible models from the Roman tradition. Nevertheless, he assumes that 'Divus Augustus ... had a lineal connection with Euhemerus' Zeus' (p. 18).

I have to admit that I do not find Bosworth's arguments convincing. The concept of euergetism was very well known in the Greek world, and appeared in the writings of Roman authors already at the start of the 2nd century BC (see chapter III 2 B). Likewise, recording the achievements of rulers on steles had a centuries-old tradition (see chapter V 2). Moreover, the most famous king to conquer the world was Alexander the Great, whose achievements probably influenced Euhemerus' presentation of Zeus in the Ἰερὰ Ἀναγραφή.

Naturally, one cannot rule out that some educated readers of the RG might have noticed a certain analogy to Euhemerus' work. Nevertheless, I consider it doubtful and certainly indemonstrable that Ennius' *Euhemerus* was really one of the sources.

f. Lucian of Samosata

Aristoula Georgiadou and David H.J. Larmour assume the readers of Lucian's *Verae historiae* could perceive the way in which the gods were pre-

172 Diod. VI 1, 6–7 ap. Eus. *Praep. ev.* II 2, 57 = Euhem. T 36; Diod. V 46, 7 = Euhem. T 37; Lact. *Div. inst.* I 11, 33 = Euhem. T 65.

173 Lact. *Div. inst.* I 22, 27 = Euhem. T 64 A 'exemplum ceteris ad imitandum dedit'; RG 8, 5 'et ipse multarum rerum exempla imitanda posteris tradidi.' The Greek version reads: καὶ αὐτὸς πολλῶν πραγμάτων μείμημα ἑμαυτὸν τοῖς μετέπειτα παρέδωκε.

174 Lact. *Div. inst.* I 22, 22 = Euhem. T 64 A 'nam cum terras circumiret, ut in quamque regionem venerat, reges principesve populorum hospitio sibi et amicitia copulabat, et cum a quoque digrederetur, iubebat sibi fanum creari hospitii sui nomine, quasi ut posset amicitiae ac foederis memoria conservari.'

175 Lact. *Div. inst.* I 11, 45 = Euhem. T 69 A 'hominibus leges mores frumentaue paravit multaue alia bona fecit.'

sented as a parody of Euhemerus.¹⁷⁶ They point to similarities in the description of nature, the division of society into classes and inscriptions left behind by a god. However, these arguments are not convincing and I am more inclined to agree with Ulrich Rütten, who does not consider Euhemerus' work to have been a model for Lucian.¹⁷⁷

At the start of the *Verae historiae* (I 3) Lucian himself refers to the works of Ctesias, Iambulus and Homer's *Odyssey*, while Photius assumed that Lucian's sources included Antonius Diogenes' Τὰ ὑπὲρ Θούλην ἄπιστα.¹⁷⁸ It seems probable that Lucian parodied Iambulus' tale¹⁷⁹ but one cannot convincingly indicate the connection with Antonius Diogenes.¹⁸⁰

More recently Fabio Berdozzo has tried to prove that Euhemerism is completely absent from the writings of Lucian.¹⁸¹

2. Patristic literature¹⁸²

A. Rejection of Euhemerism

Only some Christian apologists criticised Euhemerus, accusing him of atheism, but none of them had actually read the Ἱερὰ Ἀναγραφή. Theophilus

176 Georgiadou, Larmour, *Lucian's Science Fiction Novel* (1998), 36–37 'the treatment of the gods in the *Verae historiae* would possibly have been recognised by Lucian's reader as a parody of Euhemerus.'

177 Rütten, *Phantasie und Lachkultur* (1997), 97 'der Text des Euhemerios ... als Modelltext für 'Wahren Geschichten' weniger in Frage kommt.'

178 Phot. *Bibl.* 166 p. 111 b 35–37 (II 148 Henry) πηγὴ καὶ ρίζα. On Lucian's sources, see e.g. Nesselrath, *Utopie-Parodie* (1993), 41–56; Georgiadou, Larmour, *op. cit.*, 22–44; von Moellendorff, *Auf der Suche* (2000), 51–55, 104–114.

179 A view held among others by Nesselrath, *op. cit.*, 52 ff.; Rütten, *op. cit.*, 97; Georgiadou, Larmour, *op. cit.*, 37–38; von Moellendorff, *op. cit.*, 53–54.

180 Reyhl, *Antonius Diogenes* (1969), did try to show the influence of Antonius Diogenes on Lucian, but other scholars have correctly rejected this view, e.g. Anderson, *Studies in Lucian's Comic Fiction* (1976), 1–7; Hall, *Lucian's Satire* (1981), 338–354; Morgan, *Lucian's True Histories* (1985), 475–490; Fusillo, *Le miroir de la Lune* (1988), 111–112 with n. 5; Nesselrath, *op. cit.*, 44–45. It should be added that Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, *Hellenistische Dichtung* (1924), II, 3, n. 1, was of the opinion that Antonius Diogenes knew Euhemerus' Ἱερὰ Ἀναγραφή since he used the Doric form Ζᾶν in reference to Zeus. To me, however, this does not seem sufficient evidence to prove such a hypothesis.

181 Berdozzo, *Götter, Mythen* (2011), 283 'Schließlich mag es wohl kein Zufal sein, dass der Euhemerismus ... nie bei Lukian auftaucht'; Cf. p. 179 (despite the views of some earlier scholars, there is no Euhemerism in *De astrologia*).

182 On Euhemerus and Euhemerism in Christian literature, see e.g. Zucker, *Euhemerios und seine Ἱερὰ Ἀναγραφή* (1905), 465–472; Schippers, *De ontwikkeling* (1952), 38–114; Cooke, *Euhemerism* (1927), esp. 398–403; Thraede, *Euhemerismus* (1966), 883–889; Pépin, *Christianisme et mythologie* (1981), 175–181; Vermader, *La polémique des apologistes latins* (1982), esp. 21–30.

of Antioch († ok. 180) called Euhemerus an ἄθεώτατος and surprisingly attributed to him the opinion that πάντα αὐτοματισμῷ διοικεῖσθαι.¹⁸³ There can be no doubt that he had relied on a florilegium,¹⁸⁴ perhaps one derived from Clitomachus of Carthage († 110/109 BC),¹⁸⁵ which contained numerous factual errors.¹⁸⁶

Eusebius of Caesarea († c. 340) and Theodoret of Cyrus († c. 466) cite an *index atheorum* which includes Euhemerus.¹⁸⁷ Both authors (Eusebius directly) referred to Pseudo-Plutarch's *Placita philosophorum* (c. 150 AD), which were in turn based on Aëtius' doxographical handbook.¹⁸⁸ Obviously some of the Church Fathers accused Euhemerus of atheism because they were referring to the doxographical tradition that reduced the Ἱερὰ Ἀναγραφὴ to a thesis that the Olympian gods were deified people.

B. Acceptance of Euhemerism

Clement of Alexandria († before 215) is the only Christian author to refer to the *index atheorum* tradition¹⁸⁹ and not only defend Euhemerus against the accusation of atheism but also praise the pagan ἄθεοι. It is easy to understand his point of view. He considered those who worshipped pagan gods to be atheists because they venerated something that did not exist and this prevented them from recognising the real God.¹⁹⁰ He supported his arguments by citing from a letter of the Apostle Paul.¹⁹¹ Clement was not alone in his

183 Theoph. *Ad Autol.* III 7, 6 = Euhem. T 19.

184 Diels, *Doxographi Graeci* (1879), 59; Winiarczyk, *Nochmals das Satyrspiel 'Sisyphos'* (1987), 42.

185 Némethy, *Euhemeri reliquiae* (1889), 15; van Gils, *Quaestiones Euhemereae* (1902), 99; van der Meer, *Euhemerus* (1949), 110; Grant, *The Problem of Theophilus* (1950), 184; Vallauri, *Evemero* (1956), 46; Wyss, *Doxographie* (1959), 205; Zeegers-Vander Vorst, *Les citations des poètes grecs* (1972), 135, n. 4.

186 On the views erroneously attributed Euhemerus, see Diels, *op. cit.*, 59, n. 1; Némethy, *op. cit.*, 15–16; Jacoby, *Euemeros* (1907), 964; van der Meer, *loc. cit.*; Grant, *loc. cit.*

187 Eus. *Praep. ev.* XIV 16, 1 = T 16; Theodor. *Graec. affect. cur.* II 112; III 4 = T 17 A-B.

188 See chapter I 4 C and my commentary to Euhem. T 16.

189 Cl. Al. *Protr.* II 24, 2 = T 20. Cf. Arnob. *Adv. nat.* IV 29 (T 21), where there is a similar catalogue of atheists. On Arnobius in regard to Clement, see chapter VIII 1 E c. Arnobius (V 30) also wonders why the pagans considered supporters of Euhemerism to be atheists: 'iam dudum me fateor reputantem mecum in animo rerum huiusmodi monstra solitum esse mirari, audere vos dicere quemquam ex is atheum inreligiosum sacrilegum qui deos esse omnino sunt negent aut dubitent aut qui eos homines fuisse contendat et potestatis alicuius et meriti causa deorum in numerum relatos.'

190 Cl. Al. *Protr.* II 23, 1.

191 *Ephes.* 2, 12 καὶ ἦτε ξένοι τῶν διαθηκῶν τῆς ἐπαγγελίας, ἐλπίδα μὴ ἔχοντες καὶ ἄθεοι ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ.

approach to pagan religion.¹⁹² Origen († 254) used the paradoxical terms ‘polytheistic atheism’ (ἡ πολυθεος ἀθεότης)¹⁹³ and ‘atheistic polytheism’ (ἡ ἄθεος πολυθεότης)¹⁹⁴ in reference to non-Christian religions. That is why Clement wondered why people who denied the existence of pagan gods and viewed more critically how others had gone astray in religious matters were called atheists.¹⁹⁵

Christian apologists were combating pagan religion¹⁹⁶ and that is why some of them referred to Euhemerus, who had demonstrated that the Olympian gods were deified people.¹⁹⁷ Sometimes they presented Euhemerus as a historian to make his account of pagan gods more credible.¹⁹⁸ Here one has to explain that neither Greek nor Latin apologists had ever read the Ἱερὰ Ἀναγραφὴ.¹⁹⁹ Eusebius cites only fragments from Diodorus Siculus’ summary of the Ἱερὰ Ἀναγραφὴ in his *Bibliotheca historica* (VI 1), while Lactantius knew only indirectly quotations from Ennius’ translation, the *Euhemerus sive Sacra historia*.²⁰⁰ Johannes Geffcken (1861–1935) is right to believe that the apologists rarely used Euhemerus’ work.²⁰¹

The Church Fathers also referred to Stoic Euhemerism,²⁰² which appeared in various forms. Most often pagan gods were said to be people who were deified on account of the benefactions they performed for others. It was then that they cited *homines pro diis culti* lists or used the *deos homines fuisse* topos. Some apologists, however, rejected the Stoic view that εὐεργεσία leads to apotheosis and maintained that the *Deificati* were wicked people. This negative Euhemerism (or *euhemerismus inversus*) appears for the first time in the apol-

192 See Harnack, *Der Vorwurf des Atheismus* (1905), 5–7; Winiarczyk, *Antike Bezeichnungen der Gottlosigkeit* (1992), 221–225.

193 Orig. *Exhort. ad mart.* 32.

194 Orig. *C. Cels.* I 1.

195 Cl. Al. *Protr.* II 24, 2 σωφρόνως βεβιωκότας καὶ καθεωρακότας ὀξύτερόν που τῶν λοιπῶν ἀνθρώπων τὴν ἀμφὶ τοὺς θεοὺς τούτους πλάνην.

196 See e.g. Carena, *La critica della mitologia pagana* (1923), fasc. 2, 23–55, fasc. 3, 3–38; Hanson, *The Christian Attitude to Pagan Religions* (1980), 910–973; Opelt, *Die Polemik in der christlichen lateinischen Literatur* (1980), 11–19, 73–83, 177–185; Fredouille, *Götzendienst* (1981), 866–895; Vermader, *La polemique* (1982), 3–128; Lightfoot, *Pseudo-Meliton* (2009), 387–399; Lanzillotta, *Christian Apologists* (2010), 442–464.

197 Min. Fel. *Oct.* 21, 2 = T 9; Arnob. *Adv. nat.* IV 29 = T 21; Lact. *Div. inst.* liber 1; Eus. *Praep. ev.* II 2, 52–62; Aug. *Civ. Dei* VI 7 = T 11; VII 27 = T 12; *De cons. ev.* I 23, 32 = T 13; *Epist.* 17, 3 = T 94.

198 See Euhem. T 9–13; cf. T 94.

199 Zucker, *Euhemerios* (1905), 465–470.

200 See chapter VII.

201 Geffcken, *Zwei griechische Apologeten* (1907), XVII ‘Euhemerus von den Apologeten wenig verwendet worden ist.’ Cf. *ibidem* ‘Wir werden ... zwar einige Anklänge an ihn (scil. Euhemerios) finden, aber irgend eine bedeutsame Rolle spielt er nicht.’ Also see Thraede, *Euhemerismus* (1966), 889–890.

202 See chapter VIII I D.

ogy of Athenagoras published in 177,²⁰³ and we encounter it again at the end of the antiquity in Martin of Braga's († 579) *De correctione rusticorum* (c. 7–8), which connected Euhemeristic interpretation with demonological interpretation.²⁰⁴ Sometimes Christian apologists also presented myths about pagan gods in the Euhemeristic spirit. Deserving particular attention is Firmicus Maternus' *De errore profanarum religionum*, which Euhemeristically interpreted myths regarding Ceres and Proserpina (7, 1–6 = T 93), Cretan and Theban Liber (6, 1–5; 6, 6–8 = Euhem. Falsa 7) as well as Venus (10, 1 = T 91).²⁰⁵ Moreover, Christian writers accused pagans of worshipping as gods dead people²⁰⁶ and considered pagan temples to be sepulchres.²⁰⁷ They criticised pagans for inconsistency in mourning their gods as if they had died and at the same time offering them sacrifices.²⁰⁸ It is interesting that by criticising the divinity of Jesus,

203 Athenag. *Leg. pro Chr.* 29, 1–2. See Schippers, *De ontwikkeling* (1952), 40–44. Supporters of negative Euhemerism included Tertullian (Schippers, *op. cit.*, 49–63) and Commodian (Schippers, *op. cit.*, 67–69).

204 Caspari, *Martin von Bracara's Schrift De correctione rusticorum* (1883), XCIV–C; Schippers, *op. cit.*, 100–101. On the demonological interpretation, see Vermander, *La polémique* (1982), 30–36. Other Christian writers also linked Euhemerism with various apologetic *topoi*. See Thraede, *Euhemerismus* (1966), 886.

205 See e.g. Heuten, *Iulius Firmicus Maternus* (1938); Hocheisel, *Das Urteil über die nichtchristlichen Religionen* (1972); Turcan, *Firmicus Maternus* (1982), esp. 28–63. See my commentary to Euhem. T 91, 93 and Falsa 7.

206 Iust. *Apol.* 24, 2; Theoph. *Ad Autol.* I 9; Cl. Al. *Protr.* IV 55, 2; Eus. *Praep. ev.* II 4, 1; Arnob. *Adv. nat.* VI 6; Lact. *Div. inst.* I 18, 2; II 1, 5; II 2, 4; II 2, 9; Aug. *Civ. Dei* VIII 26; Aug. *De vera rel.* 108; Ps.-Cl. Rom. *Ep.* II 3, 1.

207 E.g. Athenag. *Leg. pro Chr.* 28, 4 ἱερὰ τοὺς τάφους αὐτῶν; Cl. Al. *Protr.* III 44, 4 = Eus. *Praep. ev.* II 6, 1; Cl. Al. *Protr.* IV 49, 3 = Eus. *Praep. ev.* II 6, 9 πορμίδες καὶ μυσώλεια καὶ λαβύρινθοι ἄλλοι ναοὶ τῶν νεκρῶν, ὡς ἐκείνοι τάφοι τῶν θεῶν; Min. Fel. *Oct.* 8, 4 'templa ut busta despiciunt'; Firm. Mat. *De errore* 16, 3 'busta sunt haec, sacratissimi imperatores, appellanda, non templa'; Arnob. *Adv. nat.* VI 6.

208 Min. Fel. *Oct.* 22, 1 'Nonne ridiculum est vel lugere quod colas vel colere quod lugeas?'; Firm. Mat. *De errore* 8, 4 'Si dii sunt quos colitis cur eos ligitis? Cur eos annuis luctibus plangitis? Si lacrimis ac luctu digni sunt, cur eos divino honore cumulatis? Unum itaque e duobus facite: aut nolite eos lugere si dii sunt, aut si luctu eos dignos putatis ac lacrimis, deos eos appellare nolite, ne luctibus ac lacrimis vestris maiestas divini nominis polluat.' It should be added that already Xenophanes of Colophon (6th/5th century BC) was to have told the Eleatians not to lament over Leucothea if they considered her to be a goddess (DK 21 A 13 ap. Arist. *Rhet.* II 23, 1400 b 5 sqq. οἷον Ξενοφάνης Ἐλεάταις ἐρωτῶσιν, εἰ θύωσι τῇ Λευκοθέᾳ καὶ θρηνῶσι ἢ μὴ, συνεβούλευεν, εἰ μὲν θεὸν ὑπολαμβάνουσιν, μὴ θρηνεῖν, εἰ δ' ἄνθρωπον, μὴ θύειν). See Cerri, *Elea, Senofane* (1995), 137–155. Plutarch used Xenophanes' words in reference to Egyptian gods (*Amat.* 18, 763 D; *De superst.* 13, 171 E; *Is. et Os.* 70, 379 B), whereas Clement of Alexandria (*Protr.* II 24, 3) no longer knew the name of the person who had criticised bewailing Egyptian deities. Later Epiphanius (*Anc.* 104, 1 [I 124 Holl]) and the author of the *Theosophia Tubingensis* 69, no doubt referring to the same source, attributed the anecdote to Heraclitus of Ephesus (DK 22 B 127 = fr. 119 a¹ Marcovich). How this anecdote presumably evolved was presented by Erbse, *Fragmente griechischer Theosophien*

who died and was buried, Celsus uses exactly the same arguments as Christian apologists challenging the apotheosis of pagan heroes and gods.²⁰⁹

The attitude of the Church Fathers towards Euhemerism has been described only very generally here because a detailed presentation would go beyond the scope of this book. This issue deserves extensive discussion as the main subject of a separate work.

C. Summary and medieval Euhemerism

Only four Greek Christians (Theophilus, Clement, Eusebius and Theodoret) and four Latin Christians (Minucius Felix, Arnobius, Lactantius and Augustine) refer to Euhemerus and yet none of them had read the *Ἐπεὶ Ἀναγραφὴ* or Ennius' translation, the *Euhemerus sive Sacra historia*. Theophilus, Eusebius and Theodoret considered Euhemerus to have been an atheist because they relied on the doxographical tradition which reduced the *Ἐπεὶ Ἀναγραφὴ* to a thesis stating that the Olympian gods were deified people. Clement, however, although he cites the *index atheorum*, argues that Euhemerus was not an atheist because in his opinion the worshippers of pagan gods, on account of being unable to recognise the real God, were the real atheists. With the exception of Arnobius, the Latin apologists considered Euhemerus to have been a historian, which was supposed to make his account of pagan gods being deified people more plausible. Eusebius knew not only the doxographical tradition but also cited fragments from a *Ἐπεὶ Ἀναγραφὴ* précis found in Diodorus Siculus' *Bibliotheca historica*. Other Church Fathers used Stoic Euhemerism, which stated that euergetism led to apotheosis, and referred to *homines pro diis culti* lists as well as the *deos homines fuisse* topos. Some writers applied negative Euhemerism, according to which deified rulers were not benefactors but wicked people. Occasionally we come across Euhemeristic interpretations of myths about gods (e.g. in the writings of Firmicus Maternus). Moreover, Christian authors accused pagans of worshipping dead people and pointed to the fact that there existed tombs of pagan gods. Euhemerus and Euhemerism did not generally play an important role in 2nd-5th century Christian apologetics, at most they were used as one of many arguments against pagan religions.

In the Middle Ages Euhemerism appeared in various forms.²¹⁰ Above all it allowed for pagan mythology to be treated like historical events that

(1941), 24–25. Also see Marcovich, *Heraklit* (2001), 593–594. Nilsson, *Griechische Feste* (1906), 432, n. 4, refers to Ps.-Plut. *Apophth. Lac.* 228 E, in which this was Lycurgus' reply to the Thebans, and therefore assumes 'diese Anekdote in Wirklichkeit dem Volkswitz entstammt, der das Widerspruchsvolle des Kultes bemerkt und scharf pointiert hat.' However, I am not very convinced by this interpretation.

209 See Gamble, *Euhemerism and Christology in Origen* (1979), 12–29.

210 On medieval Euhemerism, see e.g. Schneider, *Über Kalendae Ianuariæ* (1920/21), esp. 366–370 ('Zum Euhemerismus unserer frühmittelalterlichen Quellen über

could be connected with Christianity. Euhemerism thus became, alongside typology²¹¹ and allegory,²¹² a third way of perceiving Antiquity. This form of Euhemerism was supported by the *translatio artium* concept, according to which all human skills had their inventors and were transferred from the East to the West.²¹³ Already Isidore of Seville († 636) included into history biblical events as well as tales of ancient gods and separated the honour shown to benefactors after their deaths from the divine cult, which was to have been inspired by demons.²¹⁴ Following in Isidore's footsteps were Ado of Vienne († 875) in the *Chronicon in aetates sex divisum* (PL 123, 23–138) and Petrus Comestor († 1187) in the *Historia scholastica* (PL 198, 1053–1644), both of whom put pagan gods alongside biblical figures.

In his *Speculum regum*, dedicated to Emperor Henry VI, Godfrey of Viterbo († 1192/1200) included the ruler's genealogical tree, which dated back to the sons of Noah. One of the emperor's forebears was to have been Jupiter, the king of Athens and Crete, who was deified for his benefactions.²¹⁵ The idea of pagan gods being the creators of civilization was alive throughout the Middle Ages, and the humanist Vergilius Polydorus (1470–1555) systematically presented these gods in his *De inventoribus rerum*, published in Venice in 1499. In his work Polydorus attributed to each god a particular *ars*. Rabanus Maurus († 856) stressed in his *De universo* that pagan gods were deified people,²¹⁶ and a few centuries later (c. 1267) Roger Bacon did the same in his *Opus maius*.

Parallel to including pagan myths into Christian historical and cultural tradition, there also existed an attitude which condemned pagan gods as wicked people and their cults as the deception of demons. Such opinions are apparent in the writings of Christians who had had direct experiences of missions among pagans and heretics. These authors included Gregory of Tours († 594), the author of the *Historia Francorum*²¹⁷ and Aelfric (c. 1000), who lived in England at the time of the Viking raids. In his homily *De falsis deis* Aelfric referred to Martin of Braga's *De correctione rusticorum*. He associated the gods of his contemporary pagans (Thor, Odin and Frigg) with the ancient deities. Saxo Grammaticus

den Kalender'); Cooke, *Euhemerism* (1927), 396–409, esp. 402 ff.; Alphanéry, *L'Évhémérisme et les débuts de l'histoire des religions au moyen âge* (1934), 5–27; Bolle, *In Defense of Euhemerus* (1970), esp. 27–31; von See, *Euhemerismus* (1989), 86–91; Weber, *Euhemerismus* (1994), 1–16.

211 A known example of typology was interpreting Christ as the *verus Apollo*.

212 E.g. Athena, Hera and Aphrodite were the personifications of *vita contemplativa*, *activa* and *philargica* (von See, *op. cit.*, 87). See Krewitt, *Allegorese außerchristlicher Texte* (1978), 284–290.

213 See Worstbrock, *Translatio artium* (1965), 1–22.

214 Isid. *Etym.* VIII 11.

215 Gotifred. Viterb. *Spec. reg.* I 7–8 (MGH SS 22, 37–39).

216 Hrab. Maur. *De universo* 15, 6 ('De diis gentium') [PL 111, 426–436] 'Quos pagani deos asserunt, homines olim fuisse produntur, et pro uniuscuiusque vitae meritis colunt apud suos post mortem coeperunt: ut apud Aegyptum Isis, apud Cretam Iovis.'

217 Greg. Tur. *Hist. Franc.* (MGH Scr. Rer. Merov. I 1).

(c. 1150 – c. 1220) proceeded similarly in his *Gesta Danorum* (c. 1200), where he expressed his conviction that the Scandinavian gods (e.g. Othinus, cf. I 7, 1–3) were people, and not even kings but merely wicked and risible deceivers. Snorri Sturluson (c. 1179–1241) applied a Euhemeristic interpretation to myths in his saga about Norwegian kings (*Heimskringla*) and the *Younger Edda* (i.e. *Snorri-Edda*).²¹⁸ In the prologue to *Edda*, which does not actually originate from Snorri, the Scandinavian family of gods are connect with the Trojan myth. The author of the prologue had been influenced by Martin of Braga but rejected his teaching with regard to demons and decidedly opted for the Euhemeristic version in which benefactors were deified.²¹⁹ It should be added that the application of Euhemeristic interpretation was made easy by certain aspects of Germanic myths, e.g. Odin as the wandering sorcerer or the mortality of gods. Starting from the 9th century, also Celtic monks tried to chronologically connect their traditional tales with the Old Testament and ancient pagan mythology.²²⁰ Moreover, Euhemerism was used by Byzantine authors such as John Malalas (6th century) in the *Χρονογραφία* and John Tzetzes (12th century) in the *Allegories of the Iliad and Odyssey* (Ὑπόθεσις τοῦ Ὀμήρου ἀλληγορηθεῖσα).²²¹ To end this brief review it is worth adding that Euhemeristic interpretations also appeared during the Renaissance²²² and in the age of Enlightenment.²²³

3. Jewish literature

A. Eupolemus

Eupolemus, a Jewish historian living in the Palestine in the 2nd century BC, was the author of a work about the kings of Judea (Περὶ τῶν ἐν Ἰουδαίᾳ βασιλέων).²²⁴ In it

218 Baetke, *Die Götterlehre der Snorra-Edda* (1950).

219 von See, *Euhemerismus* (1989), 90 ‘folgt im Gebrauch des Euhemerismus entschieden der εὐεργέται-Version.’

220 von See, loc. cit. ‘Seit dem 9. Jh. ist die gelehrte Klosterliteratur bemüht, den mythologischen Sagenkreis im euhemeristischen Sinne mit alttestamentlichen und antik-heidnischen Traditionen chronologisch zu verknüpfen.’

221 Also see *Chron. Pasch.* 44–45 (PG 92, 164 B – 165 B) and Georg. Monach. *Chronicon* I 4, 15 (PG 110, 105 B).

222 Gruppe, *Geschichte der klassischen Mythologie* (1921), 29–31; Seznec, *La survivance des dieux antiques* (1940), 24–26; Ternes, *L’interprétation dite évhémériste* (1986), 321–331.

223 Manuel, *The Eighteenth Century Confronts the Gods* (1959), esp. 83–125 (‘The Euhemerists and Isaac Newton’).

224 See e.g. Freudenthal, *Hellenistische Studien* (1875), 105–130, 208–215; Susemihl, *Geschichte* (1891), I, 648–651; Jacoby, *Eupolemos* (1907), 1227–1229; Wacholder, *Eupolemus* (1974); Collins, *Between Athens and Jerusalem* (1983), 40–42; Schürer, *The History of Jewish People* (1986), III 1, 517–521; Doran, *The Jewish Hellenistic Historians* (1987), 263–270; Hengel, *Judentum und Hellenismus* (1988), 169–175;

he described the island of Urphe or Uphre (Ophir; Sopheir in the *Septuagint*) in the Red Sea,²²⁵ on which there were rich mines of gold. It was from there that King Solomon was to have delivered the gold to decorate the temple of Yahweh in Jerusalem and also build the gold columns in the temple of Zeus in Tyre.²²⁶ Ben Zion Wacholder²²⁷ assumed that Eupolemus had drawn directly from Euhemerus' Ἰερὰ Ἀναγραφή, which described rich gold mines on the island of Panchaea. This hypothesis seems quite improbable and cannot be substantiated by any serious argument.²²⁸

B. Pseudo-Eupolemus

Ps.-Eupolemus (2nd century BC) came from Samaria, for which reason he was also called the 'anonymous Samaritan'.²²⁹ This author combined biblical prehistory with Babylonian and Greek mythology. Thus Noah was identified with Belus and Cronus, who were mortals too.²³⁰ Abraham was presented as the creator of culture, who discovered astrology and divination, to which he first introduced the Phoenicians and later the Egyptians.²³¹ Abraham actually discovered astrology for a second time because it had previously been known to Enoch, who should be identified as the Greek Atlas. Martin Hengel (1926–2009) was right to say 'der entmythologisierende Euhemerismus des Samaritaners' destroyed the polytheistic pantheon of the Babylonians and Greeks.²³²

Many scholars have assumed that Ps.-Eupolemus had had an influence on book III of the *Sibylline Oracles*,²³³ but this view cannot be proved.²³⁴

Droge, *Homer or Moses?* (1989), 13–19. Edition: FGrHist 723 and Denis, *Fragmenta Pseudoepigraphorum* (1970), 179–186.

225 Ios. *Ant. Iud.* VIII 6, 4, situated Ophir in India. See Wacholder, *op. cit.*, 149, n. 77 'Perhaps Josephus, like Eupolemus, located Ophir in Euhemerus' Panchaia, hence near the Indian Ocean.'

226 FGrHist 723 F 2 b ap. Eus. *Praep. ev.* IX 34, 16.

227 Wacholder, *op. cit.*, 149–150.

228 They are certainly not the words of Wacholder, *op. cit.*, 150 'constant reiterations of the role of gold in Solomon's temple appears to echo Euhemerus.'

229 See Freudenthal, *Hellenistische Studien* (1874), I, 1874, 82–103; Wacholder, *Ps.-Eupolemus' Two Greek Fragments on Abraham* (1963), 83–113; *idem*, *Eupolemus* (1974), 287–293; Collins, *Between Athens and Jerusalem* (1983), 38–39; Schürer, *The History* (1986), III 1, 528–531; Doran, *The Jewish Hellenistic Historians* (1987), 270–274; Hengel, *Judentum und Hellenismus* (1988), 162–169. Edition: FGrHist 724 ap. Eus. *Praep. ev.* IX 17, 1–9; IX 18, 2 and Denis, *Fragmenta Pseudoepigraphorum* (1970), 197–198.

230 Eus. *Praep. ev.* IX 17, 9.

231 Eus. *Praep. ev.* IX 17, 3 τὴν ἀστρολογίαν καὶ χαλδαϊκὴν (scil. τέχνην) εὐρεῖν. See Feldman, *Abraham the Greek Philosopher* (1968), 143–156.

232 Hengel, *op. cit.*, 164.

233 Peretti, *La Sibilla babilonese* (1943), 123–152 (the author of the *Oracula Sibyllina* argued with Ps.-Eupolemus); Wacholder, *Eupolemus* (1974), 290; Hengel, *Judentum und Hellenismus* (1988), 163–164.

234 Schürer, *The History* (1986), III, 1, 530, n. 54.

C. Artapanus

Artapanus lived in Egypt, probably in the 2nd century BC, and wrote a historical novel *Περὶ Ἰουδαίων*, which included an extensive biography of Moses.²³⁵ The author identifies Moses with Hermes-Thoth and Musaeus, the supposed teacher of Orpheus. Moreover, Moses is presented as the inventor of many skills (τέχναι) as well as the creator of culture and Egyptian religion.²³⁶ It seems that Artapanus willingly interpreted Greek mythology in the Euhemeristic spirit.

D. Theodotus

Theodotus wrote an epos on the capture of the city of Shechem (cf. *Gen.* 34).²³⁷ He identified the god Hermes with Hamor, the father of Sicimus, the king of Shechem.²³⁸ One may assume that Theodotus embellished Jewish history with Euhemeristically interpreted details of Greek mythology.²³⁹

E. The Sibylline Oracles

Already Lactantius noticed that Euhemerus' account (T 54) of the conflict between the Titans and Cronus as well as the Titanomachy was similar to the account found in the *Sibylline Oracles* (III 110–154).²⁴⁰ The Sibyl

235 On Artapanus, see Freudenthal, *Hellenistische Studien* (1875), II, 143–174; Bieler, *ΘΕΙΟΣ ΑΝΗΡ* (1936), II, 26, 30–33; Fraser, *Ptol. Alexandria* (1972), I, 704–706, 714; Hengel, *Anonymität, Pseudepigraphie* (1972), 239–241; Collins, *Between Athens and Jerusalem* (1983), 32–38; Schürer, *The History* (1986), III 1, 521–525; Doran, *The Jewish Hellenistic Historians* (1987), 257–263; Droge, *Homer or Moses?* (1989), 25–35; Zellentin, *The End of Jewish Egypt* (2008), 27–73.

236 FGrHist 726 F 3 ap. Eus. *Praep. ev.* IX 27 and Denis, *Fragmenta Pseudoepigraphorum* (1970), 204–207. Also see Gager, *Moses* (1972).

237 On Theodotus, see e.g. Freudenthal, *Hellenistische Studien* (1874), I, 99–100; Laqueur, *Theodotos* 21 (1934), 1958–1959; Schürer, *op. cit.*, 561–563; Hengel, *op. cit.*, 167, n. 254 and p. 484. He was probably a contemporary of John Hyrcanus (135–105). Thus Schürer, *op. cit.*, 562.

238 FGrHist 732 ap. Eus. *Praep. ev.* IX 22 and Denis, *op. cit.*, 204–207. The *Περὶ Ἰουδαίων* title, passed on to us by Eusebius, does not seem appropriate. That is why Jacoby, *FGrHist III C* (1958), 692, suggested the title Σικίμων κτίσις.

239 According to Schürer, *op. cit.*, 562.

240 Lact. *Div. inst.* I 14, 8 'haec historia quam vera sit, docet Sibylla Erythraea eadem fere dicens, nisi quod in paucis quae ad rem non attinent discrepat.' On book III of the *Sibylline Oracles*, see e.g. Geffcken, *Komposition und Entstehungszeit der Oracula Sibyllina*, (1902), 1–17; Bousset, *Sibyllen* (1906), 270–273; Nikiprowetzky, *La troisième Sibylle* (1970); Schürer, *op. cit.*, 632–641; Collins, *The Development of the*

states that Cronus, Titan and Japetus, the sons of Gaia and Uranus, lived in the tenth generation after the deluge. It was only after the death of Uranus that it came to the conflict between Cronus and Titan as well as the first war between people. It is generally believed that book III of the *Sibylline Oracles* was composed by a Jewish author, but the range of Christian interpolations is debatable as is the extent to which the pagan oracles have been preserved.²⁴¹ There is also a lack of consensus as to when these oracles were written: any time from the 2nd century to the second half of the 1st century BC.²⁴²

Some of the earlier scholars believed the Jewish author adopted the Euhemeristic interpretation from Sibyl of Babylon (Sabbe or Sambethe)²⁴³

Sibylline Tradition (1987), 430–436; Nikiprowetzky, *La Sibylle juive* (1987), 460–542; Collins, *Seers, Sibyls* (1997), 184–188; Gauger, *Sibyllinische Weissagungen* (1998), 440–451; Gruen, *Jews, Greeks* (1998), 15–36; Merkel, *Sibyllinen* (1998), 1047–1048, 1059–1064, 1081–1108; Buitenwerf, *Book III of the Sibylline Oracles* (2003); Lightfoot, *The Sibylline Oracles* (2007), 220–242.

241 Schürer, *The History* (1986), III 1, 632.

242 2nd century BC: Collins, *Seers, Sibyls* (1997), 188; c. 150: Fraser, *Ptol. Alexandria* (1972), I, 299, 709 ‘more precisely perhaps in the period between about 170 and 145 B.C.’; Feldman, *Jew and Gentile* (1993), 294 ‘a work that, for the most part, appears to date from the middle of the second century B.C.E.’ Merkel, *Sibyllinen* (1998), 1061; Lightfoot, *The Sibylline Oracles* (2007), 221, n. 57 ‘substantially complete by the mid 2nd-c. B.C.’; c. 140: Geffcken, *Die babylonische Sibylle* (1900), 92; Rzach, *Sibyllinen* (1923), 2123; Hengel, *Judentum und Hellenismus* (1988), 163, 484; 80–40: Buitenwerf, *Book III of the Sibylline Oracles* (2003), 126–130; mid 1st century: Nikiprowetzky, *La troisième Sibylle* (1970), 208–217; c. 31/30: Gauger, *op. cit.*, 447–448. Many scholars believe that Alexander Polyhistor († after 40 BC) mentioned *Orac. Sib. III* 97–104 in Περὶ Ἰουδαίων (FGrHist 273 F 19 ap. Eus. *Arm. Chron.* p. 12 Karst). Thus e.g. Geffcken, *Die babylonische Sibylle* (1900), 89–91; Wacholder, *Eupolemus* (1974), 115; Schürer, *op. cit.*, 646–647; Parke, *Sibyls and Sibylline Prophecy* (1988), 144. Other scholars, however, reject this view: Potter, *Sibyls in the Greek and Roman World* (1990), 478; Gauger, *op. cit.*, 449–450. Athenagoras and Theophilus were the first apologists to cite fragments from book III of the *Sibylline Oracles* (Athenag. *Leg. pro Chr.* 30, 1: *Orac. Sib. III* 108–113; Theoph. *Ad Autol.* II 31, 6: *Orac. Sib. III* 97–103, 105).

243 Thus e.g. Geffcken, *Die babyl. Sibylle* (1900), 97–102; Jacoby, *Euemeros* (1907), 972; Bousset, *Die Religion des Judentums* (1926), 493–494. This hypothesis stemmed from the account of the Armenian historian Moses of Chorene (8th/9th century AD). See Akinian, *Moses Chorenaci* (1935), 534–541. According to his *History of Armenia* (I 6), Moses paraphrases the *Orac. Sib. III* 110–154, writing about the deeds of Zrvan (Chronus/Cronus), Titan and Japetus as well as citing the words of Berossos’ Sibyl. See Vetter, *Das Sibyllen-Citat bei Moses von Choren* (1892), 465–474, esp. 465–467 (translated into German). The influence of Sibyl of Babylon was already rejected by Schnabel, *Berossos* (1923), 69–93, esp. 73 ff. A separate point of view is held by Peretti, *La Sibilla babilonese* (1943), 61–69, 101–107, who considers *Orac. Sib. III* 110–154 to be ‘un poemetto pagano d’ispirazione evemeristica’ (p. 101) that was included in book III of the *Sibylline Oracles*.

but more recent scholars assume that the Euhemerism is of Jewish origin.²⁴⁴ Most Jews believed that polytheism emerged as a result of the degeneration of original monotheism.²⁴⁵ That is why Euhemerism, which regarded pagan gods to be deified humans, appealed to them.²⁴⁶ Euhemerism allowed Jews to synchronise Old Testament events with Greek and Babylonian mythology. Criticism of the deification of humans appears in the *Book of Wisdom* or *Sapientia Salomonis* (14, 12–21), the last book of the Old Testament, which emerged in the Alexandrian community most probably in the 1st century BC.²⁴⁷

Perhaps only Giovanna Vallauri²⁴⁸ doubted that Euhemerism had any effect on the *Sibylline Oracles*, but her reservations seem unfounded.²⁴⁹

F. Summary

Jewish authors willingly referred to Euhemerism because it allowed them to secularise theogony by reducing it to a history of kings as well as to synchronise Old Testament events with Babylonian and Greek mythology.²⁵⁰ Definite supporters of Euhemerism included Ps.-Eupolemus, Artapanus, Theodotus and the author of book III of the *Sibylline Oracles*. There does not seem to be sufficient evidence to assume that the chronographer Thallus was a Samaritan.²⁵¹

F. Jacoby assumed the description of the Elim oasis in Ezekiel's tragedy the Ἐξαγωγή (2nd century BC)²⁵² was indirectly based on Euhemerus' description of the island of Panchaea.²⁵³ This hypothesis is not very convinc-

244 On Euhemerism in the *Oracula Sibyllina*, see e.g. Némethy, *De vestigiis doctrinae Euhemereae in Oraculis Sibyllinis* (1897), 1–6; Geffcken, *Die babylonische Sibylle* (1900), 93–98; Schnabel, *Berosos* (1923), 78–93; Peretti, *La Sibilla* (1943), 100–121; Nikiprowetzky, *La troisième Sibylle* (1970), 29–33, 115–117, 123–124; *idem*, *La Sibylle juive* (1987), 509–515.; Buitenwerf, *Book III* (2003), 329–331; Bremmer, *Greek Fallen Angels* (2008), 94–95.

245 Nikiprowetzky, *La Sibylle* (1987), 512.

246 Cf. Barr, *Philo of Byblos* (1974), 60.

247 See Gilbert, *La critique des dieux dans le Livre de la Sagesse* (1973); Winston, *The Wisdom of Solomon* (1979), 270–271; Schürer, *The History* (1986), III 1, 568–579.

248 Vallauri, *Origine* (1960), 36.

249 See F. Vian, rev. Vallauri, *REA* 63, 1961, 492.

250 Thraede, *Euhemerismus* (1966), 882.

251 See chapter VIII 1 E h.

252 Ezekiel, *Exodus* 248–253 ap. Eus. *Praep. ev.* IX 29, 16 = TrGF 128 p. 300–301 = fr. 16 (p. 273) Lanfranchi. Cf. Description of the Αἰλιμ oasis in the *Septuagint* (*Exod.* 15, 27; *Num.* 9–10). See Lanfranchi, *L'Exagoge d'Ezechiel* (2006), 274–282 (commentary to fr. 16) and 299–337 (a history of studies regarding the tragedy from the 15th to the 20th century).

253 Jacoby, *Euemerios* (1907), 882 'die ... indirekte Benützung der Euhemerischen Lokalschilderung bei dem jüdischen Tragiker Ezechiel.' Cf. Kuiper, *De Ezechiele*

ing because it is more probable that the Jewish author simply applied the *locus amoenus* convention to describe the oasis of Elim.²⁵⁴

Klaus Thraede stresses that Jewish writers did not use Euhemerism to combat pagan religions.²⁵⁵

(1900), 277 'pseudo-Hecataeus Panchaeam illam qua inclaruerat historia sacra Euhemeri transferendam curavit in Arabiae continentem et cum amoeno loco Elim unam eandemque esse finxit. inde sua sumpserunt auctores Plinii, inde quoque Ezechiel.' This view was accepted by van Gils, *Quaestiones* (1902), 107–108 and van der Meer, *Euhemerus* (1949), 97–98.

254 On the *locus amoenus* convention, see chapter II 4 B.

255 Thraede, *Euhemerismus* (1966), 883 'Eine polemische Umformung des Euhemerismus fehlt im Judentum'.

IX. Conclusions

We know nothing for certain about the time or place of Euhemerus' birth or about where he was active. All hypotheses regarding this matter are subjective and can be easily dismissed. However, the assumption that he came from Messene in Sicily seems the most probable. Information regarding Euhemerus' voyage from Arabia Felix to the Indian Ocean on a mission for the king Cassander of Macedonia I consider to be literary fiction used to make the rest of the account more plausible. The allusion to Euhemerus in Callimachus' *Iambus* 1 is not enough to allow us to accurately date when he lived. At most we can say that he was alive at the turn of the 3rd century BC and stayed for a time in Alexandria. However, there is no reason to assume that that was where he wrote the *Ἱερὰ Ἀναγραφή*. We are also unable to say when exactly he wrote the work and all suggested dates are mere conjectures.

Euhemerus' book has not survived to this day but it can be reconstructed thanks to a précis by Diodorus Siculus (*Bibl. hist.* V 41–46; VI 1) as well as fragments of Ennius' Latin translation, the *Euhemerus sive Sacra historia*, which are found in book I of Lactantius' *Divinae institutiones*. In other words, we have only testimonia and no authentic fragments. That is why I feel earlier editors were wrong to divide these texts into fragments and testimonia (F. Jacoby, 1923, ²1957; G. Vallauri, 1956). The *Ἱερὰ Ἀναγραφή* was a utopian novel, but it should be remembered this was a utopia *sensu lato*, and not a political utopia, i.e. *sensu stricto*. Euhemerus' portrayal of society on the island of Panchaea in the Indian Ocean was in keeping with an old tradition of describing islands situated on the edges of the ancient world (cf. Homer's island of Syria, Plato's Atlantis and Hecataeus of Abdera's Helixioia). There can be no doubt that the discovery of an archipelago in the Indian Ocean was literary fiction and that is what was already the general opinion in ancient times (e.g. according to Eratosthenes, Apollodorus of Athens, Strabo and Plutarch). That is why the attempts of modern scholars to identify the island have been futile. In describing nature on the island of Panchaea Euhemerus used the *locus amoenus* literary convention. That is why I believe similarities in the description of different utopian islands cannot be construed as evidence of one author relying on another author.

Euhemerus also applied the first-person narrative. The main part of the book was most probably devoted to the deeds of Uranus, Cronus and Zeus

as recorded by the last of these on a golden stele. Here we are dealing with an original politico-religious theogony that drew on the traditional poetic theogony. First the author recounted in the Sophistic spirit the history of the emergence of culture, stating that human existence was originally primitive, like that of animals. And it was Zeus who first prohibited cannibalism, gave people laws and led to a refinement of customs. Moreover, he supported the inventions of other people. Zeus' extensive travels allowed Euhemerus to present various countries and draw attention to their treasures. The author wrote about Babylonia, Syria and Cilicia, Egypt and the pyramids, Arabia Felix, Palestine and the Jews, Phoenicia, Caria and Rhodes as well as Cyprus and Crete. He used aetiology and etymology to explain the names and epithets of gods. The book was attractive on account of its descriptions of people being transferred to exist among the stars (καταστερισμός) and the application of proverbs. The *Ἱερὰ Ἀναγραφή* mentioned not only Olympian gods, but also heroes (Cadmus and Harmonia).

I have tried to show that Diodorus' account of Euhemerus' theological views (VI 1, 1–2 = T 25) is plausible. Although in the *Ἱερὰ Ἀναγραφή* there was no clear division between earthly and heavenly gods, the book did mention Uranus laying offerings to heavenly deities, the deification of Uranus by Zeus and Zeus' self-deification. This is why Diodorus came to the conclusion that Euhemerus believed in the existence of both types of deity and expressed this view using his favourite, stereotypical phrases. In my opinion, one cannot rule out that Diodorus also added the names of other deified people (Heracles, Dionysus and Aristaeus). My hypothesis defends Diodorus' text and explains why he considered Euhemerus to have been a supporter of the *theologia dipertita*.

Euhemerus did not formulate a new theory of religion and was in no way original, as he referred to previously known views. He was influenced by old Greek concepts, such as the deification of heroes, gods creating their own cults and the tradition of Zeus' tomb on Crete. In his book an important role was played by euergetism, as could already be found in the epic poetry of Homer, and according to which a person could be called a god if he became a benefactor (εὐεργέτης) or saviour (σωτήρ). Around the year 500, Hecataeus of Miletus began a trend in applying a rationalistic interpretation to myths, which, once deprived of all miraculous and unbelievable aspects, reflected real historical events. This led to the desacralisation of myths and allowed for myths regarding Olympian gods to also be interpreted as historical events. In the second half of the 5th century Sophists and philosophers became interested in the origins of religion, which soon led to the emergence of several theories on how belief in gods began. Prodicus may even be regarded as a precursor of Euhemerus, because he considered gods to be deified benefactors. Towards the end of the 5th century there emerged the cult of commanders and rulers (in 404/403 the inhabitants of the island

of Samos granted divine honours to the Spartan commander Lysander). An important role in preparing the way for the Hellenistic ruler cult was played by the Macedonian monarchs Philip II and Alexander the Great. In my opinion, it is hard to speak of sources to Euhemerus' theological concepts *sensu stricto*. It is unlikely that he relied on any specific works in writing the *Ἱερὰ Ἀναγραφή*. More probably he relied on his general knowledge of Greek literature, philosophy and religion as well as his observations of the power struggles that followed the death of Alexander the Great.

I have rejected the hypothesis that Hieria and Panchaea were one and the same island. My impression is that Euhemerus presented two, quite distinct socio-political systems. Hieria had a monarchy. There the land was divided between the people and the king, of which he had the greater part and moreover received a tenth of everyone else's crops. The economy was based on the export of frankincense and myrrh. From the sale of these products the islanders most probably bought all the commodities they needed, for Hieria had no other riches. The existence of private ownership and individual trade must have led to social stratification.

The situation on Panchaea was quite different. There society was divided into three classes. In the ruling class were the priests, who took over control after the dynasty founded by Zeus had died out. Here most of the inhabitants owned no private property. Only the farmers and shepherds had their own houses and gardens, thanks to which they were able to lead normal family lives. The priests resided permanently on the premises of a large temenos, whereas the soldiers lived in forts. Panchaea had a collective economy because the farmers and shepherds submitted all their crops and livestock to be distributed by the priests evenly among the islanders. Common ownership and the collective economy are the features of an archaic community. Panchaea had a typical closed society that had no contacts with the outside world and was entirely self-sufficient. Euhemerus deliberately presented such an archaic community to make it easier for the reader to believe that on this island there really existed a stele on which were recorded the *res gestae* of Uranus, Cronus and Zeus.

In my opinion, Euhemerus did not model the writing of the *Ἱερὰ Ἀναγραφή* on the work of any particular author. Like every educated Greek of his day, he had a general knowledge of Egypt and India and understood the concept of society being divided into three classes. He had most probably read the works of authors such as Herodotus, Plato, Isocrates, Onesicritus, Nearchus, Hecataeus of Abdera and Megasthenes, but Panchaeian society was of Euhemerus' own invention. We may only speak of certain literary similarities or reminiscences but not of sources *sensu stricto*.

On the island of Panchaea there was a temple that had been built by Zeus when he was the ruler of the world. Although some of this temple's features (massive columns and a dromos) resemble the features of Egyptian and

Doric temples, I presume the sanctuary of Zeus Triphylus was invented by Euhemerus. The description of nature within the temenos resembles that of other utopian islands, such as Plato's Atlantis or Hecataeus of Abdera's Helixioia, but this does not necessarily mean that Euhemerus relied on these authors, as this was in keeping with the *locus amoenus* convention, which was used by authors since the time of Homer to the end of the Roman Empire.

On the golden stele there was an inscription with Panchaeian writing, which resembled Egyptian hieroglyphs. Zeus had his achievements as well as those of Uranus and Cronus recorded on this stele, whereas Hermes later added the achievements of Artemis and Apollo. It seems that the reigns of these rulers constituted the main part of the Ἱερὰ Ἀναγραφὴ. Euhemerus' account of the discovery of a stele is very much part of an ancient Greek literary tradition, for both Herodotus and Plato also wrote about the steles in temples. That is why we do not have to assume any Egyptian influences. The theme of discovering steles or ancient books was particularly popular in the Hellenistic period as well as during the Roman Empire, not only among pagans but also among Jews and Gnostics.

The priests, whom Zeus himself had brought over from Crete, spent most of their time offering sacrifices and extolling the benefactions of the gods with hymns and encomia. But they also exercised political control, for they were responsible for the administration of justice as well as the fair distribution of livestock and crops. The social status of Panchaeian priests was quite different to that of Egyptian priests and any similarities are very superficial.

Modern scholars have given several different interpretations of the Ἱερὰ Ἀναγραφὴ. As unconvincing I consider the following: the destruction of belief in the Olympian gods; a satire on the ruler cult; preparing the way for granting Cassander divine honours; presenting an ideal state system; promoting the idea of the unity and brotherhood of all the peoples as well as the reinterpretation of Greek mythology. On the other hand, I think it is probable that Euhemerus wanted to present the origins of religion and thus joined the debate regarding the ruler cult at the start of the Hellenistic period. However, we cannot say whether he merely wished to explain the emergence of the ruler cult or whether he also wanted to justify and promote it among Greeks.

Ennius translated Euhemerus' book sometime between c. 200 and c. 194 BC to prepare the way for the possible deification of Scipio Africanus. The translation was written in prose and was probably quite a free version. Varro had certainly read it and Cicero perhaps did so, too. However, Lactantius, who included 12 'citations' in his *Divinae institutiones*, most probably had only indirect access to the work. Therefore these 'citations' cannot be considered authentic fragments from Ennius' *Euhemerus sive Sacra historia*, even if seven of them do reveal the characteristics of archaic prose.

Euhemerism, *sensu stricto*, is the reduction of Olympian gods to the role of deified people, but it does not specifically concern the apotheosis of peo-

ple who had served humanity well as this view had already existed before Euhemerus. The basis of Euhemerism is the exercising of royal power, but combined with euergetism.

The Ἱερὰ Ἀναγραφὴ had a direct influence on the authors of mythological novels (Dionysius Scytobrachion and Dinarchus of Delos). In the 3rd century it was read by Callimachus and Eratosthenes, and in the 2nd century it was translated into Latin by Ennius. The Stoic Persaeus of Citium, referring to the Sophist Prodicus, stated that one of the seven types of deity were deified people. Other Stoics transformed Persaeus' opinion into a religio-historical method that was willingly adopted by historians, the authors of mythological (Hyginus) and doxographical (Aëtius) handbooks as well as Christian apologists. It was often expressed in the view that benefactions lead to apotheosis, in the listing of people who were worshipped as gods (*homines pro diis culti*) or the view that the gods were people (*deos homines fuisse*). Stoic Euhemerism was popular in Hellenistic historiography (including the works of Mnaseas of Patara, Nicagoras of Cyprus, Polybius, Castor of Rhodes and Diodorus Siculus), whereas in the time of the Roman Empire we find it in the works of the chronographer Thallus, Philo of Byblos and Sisyphus of Cos. Some Latin authors believed that Saturn was a man. They included Cassius (Hemina?), Cornelius Nepos, Julius Hyginus, Pompeius Trogus, the author of the *Origo gentis Romanae* and Servius Auctus (or Servius Danielis), but these were not typical Euhemerists since they did not consider all Roman gods to be humans. Although Varro had read Ennius' *Euhemerus sive Sacra historia*, he was not a supporter of Euhemerism because he preferred the cosmic and allegorical interpretation of gods. The author of the *Index deorum cognominum* was also not an Euhemerist.

Only four Greek Christians (Theophilus, Clement, Eusebius and Theodoret) and four Latin Christians (Minucius Felix, Arnobius, Lactantius and Augustine) refer to Euhemerus and yet none of them had read the Ἱερὰ Ἀναγραφὴ or Ennius' translation, the *Euhemerus sive Sacra historia*. Theophilus, Eusebius and Theodoret considered Euhemerus to be an atheist because they based their opinions on the doxographical tradition, which reduced the Ἱερὰ Ἀναγραφὴ to a thesis that the Olympian gods were deified humans. Although Clement cited the catalogue of atheists, he defended Euhemerus against the charge of atheism. The Latin apologists, with the exception of Arnobius, considered Euhemerus to have been a historian, which was supposed to make his account of pagan gods being deified humans more plausible. Eusebius knew not only the doxographical tradition, but also cited fragments from a précis of the Ἱερὰ Ἀναγραφὴ found in book VI of Diodorus Siculus' *Bibliotheca historica*. Other Church Fathers cited Stoic or negative Euhemerism, according to which deified rulers were not benefactors but transgressors. Occasionally we come across Euhemeristic interpretations of myths about gods (e.g. in the work of Firmicus Maternus). Moreover, Chris-

tian writers accused pagans of worshipping dead people and pointed to the existence of tombs of pagan gods. The views of Euhemerus and Euhemerism did not play a particularly important role in Christian apologetics of the 2nd–5th centuries, but it was one of many arguments used against pagan religion.

Jewish authors willingly applied Euhemeristic interpretation because it helped secularise theogony to the mere history of kings and synchronise Old Testament events with Babylonian and Greek mythology. Furthermore, they believed that polytheism resulted from the degeneration of original monotheism. Jewish supporters of Euhemerism included Pseudo-Eupolemus, Artapanus and Theodotus as well as the author of book III of the *Sibylline Oracles*, but they did not use it to combat pagan religions.

Various forms of Euhemeristic interpretation also appeared during the Middle Ages, the Renaissance and the Enlightenment.

Appendix I: Homines pro diis culti

(Below are only those testimonies that cite at least three people)

1. Leo Pellaeus
FGrHist 659 T 2 a ap. Aug. Civ. Dei VIII 5 – Picus, Faunus, Aeneas, Romulus, Heracles, Asclepius, Liber, the Tyndaridae (i.e. Castor and Pollux)
2. Scaevola
=Varro, Curio fr. V Cardauns ap. Aug. Civ. Dei IV 27 – Heracles, Asclepius, Castor, Pollux
3. Varro
Ant. rer. div. fr. 32 Cardauns ap. Serv. auct. Verg. Aen. VIII 275 (II 236 Thilo) –Faunus, Amphiaras, Tyndareus, Castor, Pollux, Liber, Heracles
4. Cicero
 - a) Leg. II 19 – Heracles, Liber, Asclepius, Castor, Pollux, Quirinus
 - b) Nat. deor. II 62 – Heracles, Castor, Pollux, Asclepius, Liber, Romulus
 - c) Nat. deor. III 39 – Alabandus, Tennes, Ino, Palaemon, Heracles, Asclepius, the Tyndaridae, Romulus
 - d) Nat. deor. III 45 – Heracles, Asclepius, Liber, Castor, Pollux, Aristaeus, Theseus, Achilles
 - e) Tusc. disp. I 28 – Romulus, Heracles, Liber, the Tyndaridae, Ino
 - f) Consol. fr. 11 Müller ap. Lact. Div. inst. I 15, 20 – Cadmi progenies aut Amphitryonis aut Tyndari (i.e. Dionysus, Heracles, the Tyndaridae)
5. Philodemus
De piet. (P. Herc. 247, col. V a) p. 78 Schober – the Dioscuri, Heracles
6. Diodorus Siculus
 - a) Bibl. hist. IV 48, 6 – Heracles, the Tyndaridae
 - b) Bibl. hist. VI 1, 2 ap. Eus. Praep. ev. II 2, 53 – Heracles, Dionysus, Aristaeus

7. Horatius
 - a) Carm. III 3, 9–16 – Pollux, Heracles, Bacchus, Quirinus
 - b) Carm. IV 8, 22–34 – Romulus, Heracles, the Tyndaridae, Liber
 - c) Epist. II 1, 5–6 – Romulus, Liber, Castor, Pollux
8. Dionysius Halicarnasseus

Ant. Rom. VII 72, 13 – Heracles, Asclepius, the Dioscuri, Helena, Pan
9. Ovidius

Amores III 8, 51–52 – Quirinus, Liber, Alcides (=Heracles), Caesar
10. Philo Alexandrinus

Leg. ad Gai. 78 (VI 170 Cohn–Reiter) – Dionysus, Heracles, the Dioscuri, Trophonius, Amphiaraus, Amphilochous
11. Silius Italicus

Pun. XV 78–83 – Amphytryonades (= Heracles), Liber, Ledaï fratres (=Castor and Pollux), Quirinus
12. Aëtius

Plac. I 6, 15 (p. 297 Diels) ap. Ps.-Plut. Plac. 880 C – Heracles, the Dioscuri, Dionysus
13. Tacitus

Annal. IV 38 – Heracles, Liber, Quirinus
14. Iustinus
 - a) Apol. 21, 2–3 – Asclepius, Dionysus, Heracles, the Dioscuri, Perseus, Bellerophon, Ariadne
 - b) Dial. cum Tryph. 69, 1–3 – Dionysus, Heracles, Asclepius
15. Athenagoras

Leg. pro Chr. 29, 1–2 – Heracles, Asclepius, Castor, Pollux, Amphiaraus, Ino, Palaemon
16. Apuleius

De deo Socr. 15, 153–154 – Amphiaraus, Mopsus, Osiris
17. Aelius Aristides
 - a) Or. 38, 21 Keil – Amphiaraus, Trophonius, Amphilochous, Asclepius
 - b) Or. 1, 374 Lenz – Heracles, the Dioscuri
18. Galenus

ap. Al-Biruni, Al-Hind (India), p. 168 Sachau – Asclepius, Dionysus, Heracles
19. Hyginus

Fab. 224 – Heracles, Liber, Castor, Pollux, Perseus, Arcas, Ariadne, Callisto, Cynosura, Crotus, Icarus, Erigone, Ganymedes, Myrtilus, Asclepius, Pan, Melicertes

20. Pausanias
 - a) Graec. descr. I 34, 2 – Amphiaraus, Protesilaus, Trophonius
 - b) Graec. descr. VIII 2, 4 – Aristaeus, Britomartis, Heracles, Amphiar-
aus, Pollux, Castor
21. Maximus Tyrius

Dissert. 9, 7 – Asclepius, Heracles, Dionysus, Amphilochous, the Di-
oscuroi, Minos, Achilles
22. Curtius Rufus

Hist. Alex. VIII 5, 8 – Heracles, Liber, Pollux, Castor
23. Clemens Alexandrinus
 - a) Protr. II 26, 7 – the Dioscuroi, Heracles, Asclepius
 - b) Protr. II 30, 1–5 – Asclepius, Castor, Pollux, Heracles
 - c) Strom. I 21, 105, 1–3 – Dionysus, Heracles, Asclepius, Castor, Pollux
24. Porphyrio

Commentum in Hor. ep. II 1, 5 (p. 369 Holder) – Romulus, Liber, Cas-
tor, Pollux, Heracles
25. Sextus Empiricus

Adv. math. IX 35–37 – Heracles, the Tyndaridae
26. Tertullianus

Ad nat. II 14, 1–15, 1 – Heracles, Asclepius, Theseus, Castores, Perseus,
Erigone
27. Minucius Felix

Oct. 22, 7 – Erigone, Castores, Asclepius, Heracles
28. Origenes
 - a) C. Cels. III 22 – the Dioscuroi, Heracles, Asclepius, Dionysus
 - b) C. Cels. III 34–35 – Zamolxis, Mopsus, Amphilochous, Amphiaraus,
Trophonius
 - c) C. Cels. III 42 – Asclepius, Dionysus, Heracles
 - d) C. Cels. VII 35 – Trophonius, Amphiaraus, Mopsus
29. Cyprianus

Quod idola 2 – Melicertes, Leucothea, Castores, Asclepius, Heracles
30. Porphyrius

Ad Marcel. 7 p. 278 Nauck – Heracles, the Dioscuroi, Asclepius
31. Arnobius
 - a) Adv. nat. I 38 – Liber, Ceres, Asclepius, Minerva, Triptolemus,
Heracles
 - b) Adv. nat. I 41 – Liber, Asclepius, Heracles, Attis, Romulus
 - c) Adv. nat. II 74 – Heracles, Asclepius, Mercurius, Liber
 - d) Adv. nat. III 39 – Heracles, Romulus, Asclepius, Liber, Aeneas

32. Lactantius
 - a) Div. inst. I 15, 5–6 – Heracles, Castor, Pollux, Asclepius, Liber
 - b) Div. inst. I 15, 23 – Heracles, Liber, Asclepius, Castor, Pollux, Quirinus
 - c) Div. inst. I 15, 26 – Heracles, Liber, Asclepius, Castor, Pollux
 - d) Div. inst. I 18, 1 – Heracles, Ceres, Liber, Asclepius, Minerva
See 4 f
33. Eusebius
 - a) Praep. ev. V 3, 2 – Heracles, the Dioscuri, Dionysus
 - b) Praep. ev. X 12, 17–19 – Dionysus, Heracles, Asclepius, Castor, Pollux
See 6 b
34. Athanasius

Orat. c. gent. 12 – Dionysus, Hercules, the Dioscuri, Hermes, Perseus, Soteira (=Artemis)
35. Pseudo-Clemens Romanus
 - a) Hom. VI 22, 2 – Asclepius, Heracles, Dionysus, Hector, Achilles, Patroclus, Alexander the Great
 - b) Recogn. X 25, 2 – Adonis, Osiris, Hector, Achilles, Patroclus, Alexander the Great
36. Firmicus Maternus
 - a) De err. prof. rel. 7, 6 – Liber, Castor, Pollux, Heracles
 - b) De err. prof. rel. 12, 8 – Castores, Heracles, Asclepius
37. Augustinus

Civ. Dei XVIII 14 – Ino, Melicertes, Castor, Pollux
See 1, 2
38. Socrates Scholasticus

Hist. eccl. III 23 – Heracles, Dionysus, Asclepius
39. Theodoretus

Graec. affect. cur. III 26–30 – Heracles, Asclepius, Castor, Pollux, Dionysus
40. Pseudo-Caesarius Nazianzenus

Erotapokriseis 111 p. 91 Riedinger– Dionysus, Heracles, Asclepius, Adonis, Osiris, Hector, Achilles, Patroclus, Alexander the Great

Appendix II: Deos homines fuisse

1. Prodicus
DK 84 B 5 ap. Min. Fel. Oct. 21, 2
2. Persaeus
a) SVF I 448 ap. Philod. De piet. 9–10 p. 75–76 Gomperz = p. 117 Schober
b) SVF I 448 ap. Cic. Nat. deor. I 38
3. Chrysippus
a) SVF II 1076 ap. Philod. De piet. 13 p. 80 Gomperz = p. 119 Schober
b) SVF II 1077 ap. Cic. Nat. deor. I 39
4. Dionysius Scytobrachion
a) F 6 Rusten ap. Diod. Bibl. hist. III 56, 5; 57, 2; 57, 5; 57, 8
b) F 7 Rusten ap. Diod. Bibl. hist. III 60, 3; 60, 5
c) F 10 Rusten ap. Diod. Bibl. hist. III 71, 5; 72, 1
d) F 12 Rusten ap. Diod. Bibl. hist. III 73, 1; 73, 3; 73, 5; 73, 8
5. Leo Pellaeus
a) FGrHist 659 T 2 a ap. Aug. Civ. Dei VIII 5
b) FGrHist 659 T 2 b ap. Arnob. Adv. nat. IV 29
c) FGrHist 659 F 5 ap. Min. Fel. Oct. 21, 3
d) FGrHist 659 F 6 ap. Aug. Civ. Dei VIII 27
6. Polybius
Hist. XXXIV 2, 5 ap. Str. I 2, 15 p. 23–24
7. Aristaeas
Epist. ad Philocratem 135–137
8. Sapientia Salomonis
c. 14, 12–21
9. Scaevola
ap. Varron. Curio fr. V Cardauns (=Aug. Civ. Dei VIII 5)
10. Varro
Ant. rer. div. fr. 32 Cardauns ap. Serv. auct. Verg. Aen. VIII 275 (II 236 Thilo)

11. Cicero
 - a) Leg. II 19; II 27
 - b) Nat. deor. I 119; II 62; III 39; III 45
 - c) Rep. III 40 ap. Aug. Civ. Dei XXII 4
 - d) Tusc. disp. I 28
 - e) Consol. fr. 11 Müller ap. Lact. Div. inst. I 15, 19–20
12. Diodorus Siculus
 - a) Bibl. hist. I 2, 4; 13, 1; 15, 3; 17, 2 (Osiris); 18, 5 (Osiris); 20, 5 (Osiris); 20, 6 (Osiris); 21, 6 (Osiris); 22, 1 (Isis); 22, 2 (Isis); 24, 7 (Heracles); 90, 3
 - b) Bibl. hist. II 38, 5 (Dionysus); 39, 4 (Heracles)
 - c) Bibl. hist. III 9, 1; 63, 4. See Dionysius Scytobrachion above.
 - d) Bibl. hist. IV 1, 4; 1, 7 (Dionysus); 3, 2 (Dionysus); 3, 5 (Dionysus, Demeter); 38, 5 (Heracles); 39, 1 (Heracles); 48, 6; 62, 4 (Theseus); 81, 3; 82, 5; 82, 6 (Aristaeus); 85, 5 (Orion);
 - e) Bibl. hist. V 21, 2 (Caesar); 55, 7 (Halia); 64, 2; 64, 6 (the Dactyls); 66, 3; 67, 5; 68, 1 (Hestia); 68, 3 (Demeter); 71, 5; 71, 6 (Zeus); 72, 1 (Zeus); 74, 3 (Hephaestus); 79, 2 (Minos); 79, 4; 83, 3 (Tennes)
 - f) Bibl. hist. VI 1, 2; 1, 11; 2, 1; 6, 1 (the Dioscuri)
 - g) Bibl. hist. VII 5, 2 (Aeneas)
13. Horatius

Epist. II 1, 5–6
14. Dionysius Halicarnasseus

Ant. Rom. VII 72, 13
15. Manilius

Astron. IV 933–935
16. Plinius Maior

Nat. hist. II 19
17. Plutarchus

De Iside et Osiride 23 p. 359 E–360 B
18. Silius Italicus

Pun. XV 78–83
19. Aëtius

Plac. I 6, 15 p. 296–297 Diels (= Chrysip. SVF II 1009 p. 300, 31–32)
ap. Ps.-Plut. Plac. phil. 880 C
20. Tacitus

Annal. IV 38
21. Philo Byblius

Phoen. hist. (FGrHist 790 F 1) ap. Eus. Praep. ev. I 9, 29

22. Iustinus
Apol. 9, 1; 24, 2
23. Ps.-Clemens Romanus
Epist. II ad Cor.
24. Didache
c. 6, 3
25. Athenagoras
Leg. pro Chr. 28, 4
26. Apuleius
De deo Socr. 15, 153
27. Aelius Aristides
a) Or. 1, 374 Lenz
a) Or. 38, 21 Keil
28. Maximus Tyrius
Dissert. 2, 5
29. Hyginus
Fab. 224
30. Pausanias
Graec. descr. I 34, 2; VIII 2, 4
31. Theophilus Antiochenus
Ad Autol. I 9
32. Galenus
Protr. 9
33. Ps.-Meliton
Oratio p. 43 l. 10 – p. 45 l. 11 Cureton
34. Curtius Rufus
Hist. Alex. VIII 5, 8
35. Acta Apollonii
c. 22 p. 32 Knopf–Krüger
36. Clemens Alexandrinus
a) Protr. III 44, 4; III 45, 5; IV 49, 3; cf. X 91, 1
b) Strom. I 21, 105, 1–3
37. Sextus Empiricus
Adv. math. IX 17. 34. 51
38. Tertullianus
a) Ad nat. II 7, 4; 9, 10; 12, 4; 14, 1
b) Apolog. 10, 3–4. 7. 9–11; 11, 1; 12, 1

- c) De execrandis gentium diis p. 1175–1177 Oehler
- d) De spect. 13, cf. 6
- e) De idol. 9, 3
- 39. Minucius Felix
Oct. 8, 4; 22, 7; 23, 9. 13
- 40. Commodianus
Instr. I 6
- 41. Cyprianus
Quod idola 1–3
- 42. Origenes
a) C. Cels. III 22. 34–35. 42
b) Hom. in Ierem. 5, 3
- 43. Porphyrius
Ad Marcel. 7 p. 278 Nauck
- 44. Arnobius
Adv. Nat. I 37–38. 41; II 74; III 39; IV 29; V 30; VI 6
- 45. Lactantius
a) Div. inst. I 10, 1–2; I 11, 17; I 13, 8; I 15, 5–6. 19–20. 23. 26–27; I 17, 5; I 18, 1. 3; II 1, 5; II 2, 2–4. 9
b) Epit. div. inst. 6, 4; 13, 2
c) De ira 11, 7–8
- 46. Eusebius
Praep. ev. I 9, 29; II 2, 53; II 4, 1; II 5, 3; II 6, 13; III 3, 17; V 3, 2; X 12, 17–19; XIV 16, 13
- 47. Ps.-Clemens Romanus
a) Hom. V 23; VI 22; X 9
b) Recogn. IV 30; X 25
- 48. Firmicus Maternus
De err. prof. rel. 6, 1; 7, 6; 12, 8; 16, 3
- 49. Athanasius
Orat. c. gent. 9. 12. 16
- 50. Ps.-Ambrosius
Quaest. Vet. et Novi Test. 114, 1; 114, 29 (CSEL 50, 303 et 316)
- 51. Macrobius
a) Comment. in Somn. Scip. I 9, 6
b) Satur. I 7, 24

52. Prudentius
 - a) C. Symm. I 145–158
 - b) Perist. V 35–36
53. Hieronymus
 - a) De vir. ill. 22 (Hegesippus)
 - b) Comment. in Esaiam proph. XVIII 65 (CCL 73, 747).
 - c) Comment. in Math. III 16, 16 (CCL 77, 140)
54. Augustinus
 - a) Civ. Dei IV 27; VI 7; VII 27; VIII 5. 12. 26; XVIII 5. 14; XXII 4
 - b) De cons. ev. I 23, 32. 34
 - c) De vera relig. 108 (CCL 32, 256)
 - d) Epist. 17, 3
 - e) Sermo 273, 3 (PL 38, 1249)
55. Socrates Scholasticus

Hist. eccl. III 23
56. Theodoretus

Graec. affect. cur. II 97; III 25–30
57. Acta S. Sebastiani

c. 12, 40–41 (PL 17, 1038 D – 1039 B)
58. Ps.-Caesarius Nazianzenus

Erotapokriseis 111 p. 91 Riedinger
59. Johannes Malalas

Chronogr. II 18 p. 39 Thurn
60. Isidorus Hispalensis

Etym. VIII 11, 1–4
61. Mythographus Vaticanus II

c. 2 (CCL 91 C, 96)
62. Symeon Metaphrastes

Mart. Ign. 7, 4 (II 387 Funk-Dieckamp)

Appendix III: The tombs of the gods

1. Aphrodite

- a) Ps.-Clem. Rom. Hom. V 23, 3; VI 21, 3
- b) Ps.-Clem. Rom. Recogn. X 24, 2
- c) Ps.-Caesar. Erotapokriseis 111 p. 91 Riedinger
- d) Mart. Rom. Ignat. 3, 2 (II 344 Funk-Diekamp)
- e) Symeon Metaphr. Mart. Ign. 7, 5 (II 387 Funk-Diekamp)

2. Apollo

- a) Mnaseas (fr. 9 Cappelletto) ap. Fulgent. Expos. serm. ant. 2
- b) Min. Fel. Oct. 21, 1
- c) Porph. Vita Pyth. 16
- d) Cyr. Al. C. Iul. X 342 (PG 76, 1028 A)

3. Ares

- a) Ps.-Clem. Rom. Hom. V 23, 3; VI 21, 3
- b) Ps.-Clem. Rom. Recogn. X 24, 2
- c) Ps.-Caesar. Erotapokriseis 111 p. 91 Riedinger
- d) Chron. Pasch. 38 (PG 92, 149 B)
- e) Cedrenus, Hist. comp. 30 (PG 121, 57 B)

4. Asclepius

- a) Cic. Nat. deor. III 57 (secundus Aesculapius: 'fulmine percussus dicitur humatus esse Cynosuris'; tertius Aesculapius: 'in Arcadia non longe a Lusio flumine sepulcrum eius ostenditur')
- b) Clem. Alex. Protr. II 30, 3 (ἐν Κυνοσουρίδος ὀρίοις)
- c) Lact. Div. inst. I 10, 2
- d) Lact. Epit. div. inst. 8, 2
- e) Ps.-Clem. Rom. Hom. VI 21, 3 (Epidaurus)
- f) Ps.-Clem. Rom. Recogn. X 24, 2
- g) Hier. Comment. in Esaiam proph. XVIII 65 (CCL 73, 747)
- h) Ps.-Caesar. Erotapokriseis 111 p. 91 Riedinger (Epidaurus)
- i) Joh. Lyd. De mens. IV 142 p. 164 Wuensch (ἐν τοῖς Κυνοσουρίδος ὀρίοις ἐτάφη et τάφος αὐτῶ ἐν Ἀρκαδίᾳ)
- j) Mart. Rom. Ignat. 3, 2 (II 344 Funk-Diekamp)
- k) Mart. Philippi in Acta Sanctorum, t. 9, Paris-Roma 1869, 546
- l) Symeon Metaphr. Mart. Ign. 7, 5 (II 387 Funk-Diekamp)

5. Cronus

A. Tomb in Sicily

- a) Philochorus (FGrHist 328 F 175) ap. Clem. Al. Protr. II 30, 3
- b) Arnob. Adv. nat. IV 25

B. Tomb in the Caucasus

- a) Ps.-Clem. Rom. Hom. V 23, 1; VI 21, 1
- b) Ps.-Clem. Rom. Recogn. X 24, 2
- c) Ps.-Caesar. Erotapokriseis 111 p. 91 Riedinger

6. Dionysus

A. Tomb in Delphi

- a) Dinarchus (FGrHist 399 F 1 b) ap. Joh. Malal. Chronogr. II 15 p. 32 Thurn
- b) Philochorus (FGrHist 328 F 7 b) ap. Joh. Malal. Chronogr. II 15 p. 32 Thurn
- c) Callim. (fr. 643 Pfeiffer = fr. 424 Asper) ap. Schol. Lycophr. Alex. 207 (II 98 Scheer)
- d) Euphorio (fr. 13 Powell = fr. 14 van Groningen) ap. Schol. Lycophr. Alex. 207 (II 98 Scheer)
- e) Plut. De Is. et Os. 35, 365 A
- f) Cephalion (FGrHist 93 F 4) ap. Joh. Malal. Chronogr. II 15 p. 32 Thurn
- g) Tat. Or. ad Gr. 8, 8
- h) Clem. Al. Protr. II 18, 2
- i) Eus. Hieron. Chron. a. 1298 p. 54 b Helm
- j) Eus. Chron. vers. Arm. p. 168 Karst
- k) Eus. Praep. ev. II 3, 26
- l) Cyr. Al. C. Iul. X 342 (PG 76, 1025 D)
- m) Syncel. Ecl. chronogr. 307 p. 190 Mosshammer
- n) Etym. Magn. s.v. Δελφοί
- o) Cedrenus, Hist. comp. 43 (PG 121, 72 A)

B. Tomb in Thebes

- a) Ps.-Clem. Rom. Hom. V 23, 3
- b) Ps.-Clem. Rom. Recogn. X 24, 2
- c) Ps.-Caesar. Erotapokriseis 111 p. 91 Riedinger

7. Hades

Ps.-Clem. Rom. Hom. V 23, 3

8. Helios

Ps.-Clem. Rom. Hom. V 23, 3; VI 21, 3

9. Hermes

- a) Ps.-Apul. Asclep. 37 (Corp. Hermet. II 347)
- b) Ps.-Clem. Rom. Hom. V 23, 3; VI 21, 3
- c) Ps.-Clem. Rom. Recogn. X 24, 2
- d) Lact. Placid. Schol. Stat. Theb. II 63–64, p. 102 Sweeney
- e) Aug. Civ. Dei VIII 26
- f) Ps.-Caesar. Erotapokriseis 111 p. 91 Riedinger

10. Poseidon

- Ps.-Clem. Rom. Hom. V 23, 3

11. Selene

- Ps.-Clem. Rom. Hom. V 23, 3; VI 21, 3

12. Uranus

- Lact. Div. inst. I 11, 65 (=Euhem. T 52)

13. Zeus

- 1) Callim. Hymn. Iov. 8–9
- 2) Callim. Iamb. 12, 16–17 (fr. 202 Pfeiffer = fr. 163 Asper)
- 3) P. Flinders Petrie 25 (= P. Litt. Lond. 191)
- 4) Dion. Scyt. fr. 13 Rusten ap. Diod. III 61, 2
- 5) Ennius, Euhem. fr. 11 Vahlen ap. Lact. Div. inst. I 11, 46 et Lact. Epit. div. inst. 13, 4 (=Euhem. T 69 A–B Winiarczyk)
- 6) Orac. Sib. VIII 47–48
- 7) Varro, De litoralibus ap. Solin. Collect. rer. mem. 11, 6–7
- 8) Cic. Nat. deor. III 53
- 9) Philod. De piet. 52 a (P. Herc. 248, col. III 4–5) p. 24 Gomperz = p. 108 Schober
- 10) Gaetulicus ap. Anth. Pal. VII 275, 6
- 11) Lucan. Phars. VIII 872
- 12) Stat. Theb. I 278–279
- 13) Mela, Chorogr. II 112
- 14) Plut. Sept. sap. conv. 10, 154 A
- 15) Ptol. Chen. Nova hist. II 16 p. 22 Chatzis ap. Phot. Bibl. 190 p. 147 b 37 (III 55 Henry)
- 16) Tat. Or. ad Graec. 27, 4
- 17) Theoph. Ad Autol. I 10, 4; II 3, 8
- 18) Athenag. Leg. pro Chr. 30, 2
- 19) Lucian. Deor. conc. 6
- 20) Lucian. De sacrif. 10
- 21) Lucian. Iup. trag. 45
- 22) Lucian. Philops. 3
- 23) Lucian. Timon 6
- 24) Acta Apoll. 22 p. 32 Knopf–Krüger

- 25) Clem. Al. Protr. II 37, 4
- 26) Min. Fel. Oct. 23, 13 (=21, 8)
- 27) Tert. Ad nat. II 17
- 28) Tert. Apolog. 25
- 29) Cypr. Quod idola 2
- 30) Orig. C. Cels. III 43
- 31) Cert. Hom. et Hes. 8 p. 328 West
- 32) Philostr. Vitae soph. II 4 (II 76 Kayser)
- 33) Porph. Vita Pyth. 17
- 34) Ps.-Pyth. ap. Anth. Pal. VII 746
- 35) Arnob. Adv. nat. IV 14; IV 25
- 36) Eus. Praep. ev. II 2, 48; III 10, 21
- 37) Firm. Mat. De errore 7, 6
- 38) Lact. Div. inst. I 11, 48
- 39) Commod. Instr. I 6, 16
- 40) Serv. Comment. Verg. Aen. VII 180 (II 140 Thilo)
- 41) Greg. Naz. Or. 5, 32 (PG 35, 705 B)
- 42) Ps.-Caesar. Nazianz. Erotapokriseis 111 p. 91 Riedinger
- 43) Acta Acacii 2 p. 58 Knopf-Krüger
- 44) Epiph. Panar. 42, 12 (II 169 Holl)
- 45) Epiph. Anc. 106 (I 128 Holl)
- 46) Ps.-Clem. Hom. V 23, 2; VI 21, 2
- 47) Ps.-Clem. Recogn. X 23, 4
- 48) Ioh. Chrys. In ep. Pauli ad Tit. hom. 3, 1 (PG 62, 677 A)
- 49) Severianus, In ep. Pauli ad Tit. 1, 12–13 p. 344 Staab
- 50) Hier. In ep. Pauli ad Tit. 1 (CCL 77 C, 30)
- 51) Hier. Ep. 70, 2 (CSEL 54, 701)
- 52) Theodor. Mops. Comment. in Acta ap. 17, 18 ap. Gannat Busamē
(English translation in Harris, *The Cretans* (1906), p. 310)
- 53) Theodor. Mops. In ep. Pauli ad Tit. 1, 12–13a comment. p. 752
Greer
- 54) Cyr. Al. C. Iul. X 342 (PG 76, 1028 B)
- 55) Theodoret. Interpr. ep. Pauli ad Tit. 1, 12 (PG 82, 861 B)
- 56) Paulin. Nol. Poema 19, 86 (CSEL 30, 121)
- 57) Nonn. Dionys. VIII 114–118
- 58) Anth. Lat. 432 Riese = 430 Shackleton Bailey
- 59) Nonnus Abbas, Collect. et expos. hist. ad Greg. Naz. Or. 2 C.
Iul. 30 (PG 36, 1049 D-1052 A)
- 60) Ioh. Ant. Hist. fr. 5 (FHG IV 542) et fr. 6, 4 (FHG IV 542) =
fr. 6, 2 Roberto (Mariev did not include these fragments in his
edition).
- 61) Chron. Pasch. 44 (PG 92, 164 BC)
- 62) Mart. Rom. S. Ign. 3, 2 (II 343–344 Funk-Diekamp)

- 63) Cosmas Hieros. Hist. ad Carm. Greg. Naz. 263 (PG 38, 504)
- 64) Syncel. Ecl. chronogr. 289 p. 179 Mosshammer
- 65) Isho'dad, Comment. in Acta p. 29 Gibson = Harris, *St. Paul* (1912), pp. 351–352
- 66) Sedul. Scot. Collect. in ep. Pauli ad Tit. (PL 103, 244 C)
- 67) Ps.-Lucian. Philopatris 10 (IV 375 Macleod)
- 68) Suda s.v. Πῆκος (IV 124 Adler)
- 69) Symeon Metaphr. Mart. Ign. 7, 5 (II 387 Funk-Diekamp)
- 70) Mich. Psellus, ἀλληγορία εἰς τὸν Τάνταλον p. 154 Duffy
- 71) Cedren. Hist. comp. 29 et 31 (PG 121, 56 C et 57 D)
- 72) Schol. Callim. Hymn. in Iov. 8 (II 42 Pfeiffer)
- 73) Schol. Luc. Iov. trag. 45 p. 78 Rabe
- 74) Schol. Arat. 73 p. 108 Martin
- 75) Commenta Bern. ad Luc. Phars. VIII 872
- 76) Schol. Carm. Greg. Naz. ap. Gaisford, *Catalogus* (1812), p. 49
- 77) Ps.-Eudocia, Viol. 414 p. 311–312 Flach

Bibliography

1. Editions

A. Editions of fragments from Euhemerus' work

a. Greek and Latin testimonia

- Mullach, F.G.A., *Fragmenta Philosophorum Graecorum collegit recensuit vertit, annotationibus et prolegomenis illustravit, indicibus instruxit*, II, Parisiis 1867 (reprint Aalen 1968), pp. 431–438.
- Némethy, G., *Euhemeri reliquiae, collegit, prolegomenis et adnotationibus instruxit*, Budapest 1889.
- Jacoby, F., *Die Fragmente der griechischen Historiker*. Neudruck vermehrt um Addenda zum Text, Nachträge zum Kommentar, Corrigenda und Konkordanz, I A [1923], Leiden 1957 (reprint Leiden-New York-Köln 1995), pp. 300–313, 20*, 36*, 41*.
- Vallauri, G., *Evemero di Messene. Testimonianze e frammenti con introduzione e commento*, Torino 1956 (Università di Torino. Pubblicazioni della Facoltà di Lettere e Filosofia, VIII 3).
- Winarczyk, M., *Euhemeri Messenii reliquiae*, Stuttgartiae–Lipsiae 1991 (Bibliotheca Scriptorum Graecorum et Romanorum Teubneriana).

b. Latin testimonia

- Columna, H., *Q. Ennii poetae vetustissimi fragmenta quae supersunt ab H. Columna conquisita disposita et explicata* (...) Nunc ad editionem Neapolitanam MDXC recusa accurante F. Hesselio (...), Amstelodami 1707, pp. 315–326 (“Evemeri sive Sacrae Historiae soluta oratione conversae fragmenta”).
- Egger, A. E., *Latini sermonis vetustioris reliquiae selectae*, Paris 1843, pp. 151–154 (“Evhemeri Sacra historia”).
- Vahlen, I., *Ennianae poesis reliquiae*, Lipsiae 1854, pp. 169–174.
- Ten Brink, B., *M. Terentii Varronis locus de urbe Roma. Varronianis accedunt Q. Ennii apologus Aesopicus et reliquiae Euhemeri versibus quadratis*, Traiecti ad Rhenum 1855, pp. 19–26.
- Müller, L., *Q. Enni carminum reliquiae. Accedunt Cn. Naevi Belli Poenici quae supersunt. Emendavit et adnotavit*, Petropoli 1884, pp. 78–82, 209–210.
- Bachrens, Ae., *Fragmenta poetarum Romanorum collegit et emendavit*, Lipsiae 1886, pp. 126–130 (“Euhemerus sive historia sacra”).
- Müller, L., *Euhemerus sive sacra historia*, in I.P. Postgate (ed.), *Corpus Poetarum Latinorum a se aliisque denuo recognitorum et brevi lectionum varietate instructorum*, I, Londini 1894, pp. 18–19.
- Vahlen, I., *Ennianae poesis reliquiae, iteratis curis recensuit*, Lipsiae 1903 (reprint Lipsiae 1928 and Amsterdam 1963), pp. 223–229.
- Bolisani, E., *Enno minore*, Padova 1935, pp. 104–125, 144–146.
- Warmington, E. H., *Remains of Old Latin, Newly Edited and Translated*, I: *Ennius and Caecilius*, Cambridge, Mass.-London 1935 (⁴1967) [LCL 294], pp. 414–430.

- Scriptorum Romanorum quae extant omnia*, III: *Quintus Ennius*, Venetiis 1964, pp. 102–108.
- Garbarino, G., *Roma e la filosofia greca dalle origini alla fine del II secolo a.C. Raccolta di testi con introduzione e commento*, Torino 1973 (Historica, Politica, Philosophica 6), I, pp. 133–137 (textus), II, pp. 288–308 (commentarius).
- Portolano, A., *L'euhemerismo da Ennio a Lattanzio*, Napoli 1975, pp. 107–120. Segura Moreno, M., *Quinto Ennio, Fragmentos. Texto revisado y traducido*, Madrid 1984 (Colección hispánica de autores griegos y latinos publicada por el Consejo Superior de Investigaciones científicas), pp. 146–149 (“Euhemerus”).
- Traglia, A., *Poeti Latini arcaici*, vol. I: *Livio Andronico, Nevio, Ennio*, Torino 1986, pp. 386–393 (“Euhemerus sive Sacra historia”).
- Courtney, E., *Archaic Latin Prose*, Atlanta, Georgia 1999 (American Classical Studies 42), pp. 27–39 (“Euhemerus”).

B. Editions of authors cited in this book

- Achilles Tatius, *Leucippe et Clitophon*, ed. E. Vilborg, Stockholm 1955 (Studia Graeca et Latina Gothoburgensia 1).
- Acta Martyrum*, edd. R. Knopf, G. Krüger, Tübingen ³1929 (Sammlung Ausgewählter Kirchen-und Dogmengeschichtlicher Quellenschriften, NF 3) [⁴1965].
- Acta S. Sebastiani Martyris*, ed. J.-P. Migne, Parisiis 1845 (PL 17), coll. 1021–1058.
- Acusilaus, in FGrHist I A (no. 2), Leiden ²1957 (reprint Leiden-New York-Köln 1995), pp. 47–58.
- Ado Viennensis, *Chronicon in aetates sex divisum*, ed. J.-P. Migne, Lutetiae Parisiorum 1852 (PL 123), coll. 23–138.
- Aelianus, *De natura animalium*, ed. A.F. Scholfield, vol. I–III, London-Cambridge, Mass. 1958–1959 (LCL 446, 448, 449).
- , edd. M. Garcia Valdés, L.A. Llera Fuego, L. Rodriguez-Noriega Guillén, Berolini-Novi Eboraci 2009.
- , *Fragmenta*, ed. D. Domingo-Forasté, Stutgardiae-Lipsiae 1994.
- , *Varia historia*, ed. M.R. Dilts, Leipzig 1974.
- Aelius Aristides, *Orationes*, vol. I, edd. F.W. Lenz, C.A. Behr, Leiden 1976–1980.
- , *Orationes*, vol. II, ed. B. Keil, Berolini 1898 (²1958).
- Aeschylus, *Tragoediae*, ed. M.L. West, Stutgardiae-Lipsiae 1998.
- Aëtius, *Placita philosophorum*, in *Doxographi Graeci*. Collegit, recensuit, prolegomenis indicibusque instruxit H. Diels, Berolini 1879 (⁴1965), pp. 267–444.
- Agatharchides, *De mari Erythraeo*, in GGM, vol. I, Parisiis 1855, pp. 111–195.
- Agathias Myrinaeus, *Historiae*, ed. R. Keydell, Berolini 1967 (CFHB 2).
- Alberuni (=Al-Biruni), *India. An Account of the Religion, Philosophy, Literature, Geography, Chronology, Astronomy, Customs, Laws and Astrology of India about A.D. 1030*. An English Edition, with Notes and Indices by E.C. Sachau, II, London 1888.
- Alcaeus, in *Poetarum Lesbiorum Fragmenta*, edd. E. Lobel-D. Page, Oxford 1955, pp. 111–291.
- Alcidamas, *Fragmenta*, in *Oratores Attici*, edd. J. G. Baiter-H. Sauppe, vol. II, Turici 1871, pp. 154–156.
- Alcman, in *Poetarum Melicorum Graecorum Fragmenta*, ed. M. Davies, vol. I, Oxonii 1991, pp. 5–132.
- Alexander Polyhistor, in FGrHist III A (no. 273), Leiden 1940 (Leiden ³1993), pp. 96–126.
- Alexis, *Comoediae*, in PCG II, Berolini-Novi Eboraci 1991, pp. 21–195.
- Ps.-Ambrosius, *Quaestiones Veteris et Novi Testamenti CXXVII*, ed. S. Souter, Vindobonae-Lipsiae 1908 (CSEL 50).

- Ammianus Marcellinus, *Rerum gestarum libri qui supersunt*, ed. W. Seyfarth, Leipzig 1978.
- Ampelius, *Liber memorialis*, ed. E. Assmann, Lipsiae 1935 (reprint Stutgardiae 1976).
- Anaxarchus, in DK II (no. 72), Berlin ⁶1952 (Zürich-Hildesheim 1992), pp. 235–240.
- Anecdota Graeca*, ed. J.-F. Boissonade, vol. I, Parisiis 1829.
- Anthologia Latina sive poesis Latinae supplementum*. Pars 1: *Carmina in codicibus scripta*, ed. A. Riese, fasc. 1–2, Lipsiae 1869–1870 (²1906).
- Anthologia Latina*. I: *Carmina in codicibus scripta*, fasc. 1: *Libri Salmasiani aliorumque carmina*, ed. D.R. Shackleton Bailey, Stutgardiae 1982.
- Anthologia Palatina*, ed. H. Beckby, vol. I–IV, München 1957–1958.
- Antipater Tarsensis in SVF III, Lipsiae 1903, pp. 244–258.
- Antiphanes, *Comoediae*, in PCG II, Berolini-Novii Eboraci 1991, pp. 312–481.
- Antisthenes, in SSR, vol. II, Roma 1990, pp. 137–225.
- Apollodorus Atheniensis, in FGrHist II B (no. 244), Berlin 1929 (reprint Leiden 1986), pp. 1022–1128.
- Ps.-Apollodorus, *Bibliotheca*, ed. J.G. Frazer, vol. I–II, Cambridge, Mass.-London 1976–1979 (¹1921) [LCL 121–122].
- , ed. K. Brodersen, Darmstadt 2004 (Edition Antike).
- Apollonius Rhodius, *Argonautica*, ed. M. Fusillo, Milano 1999 (Biblioteca Universale Rizzoli).
- Appianus, *Historia Romana*, vol. I: edd. P. Viereck, A.G. Roos, E. Gabba, Lipsiae 1962; vol. II: edd. L. Mendelssohn, P. Viereck, Lipsiae 1905 (reprint Leipzig 1986).
- Apuleius, *De deo Socratis*, in *idem, De philosophia libri*, ed. P. Thomas, Lipsiae 1921, pp. 6–35 (*Opera quae supersunt*, vol. III) [reprint Stutgardiae 1970].
- , *De mundo*, in *idem, De philosophia libri*, ed. P. Thomas (...), pp. 135–175.
- Ps.-Apuleius, *Asclepius*, in *Corpus Hermeticum*, ed. A.D. Nock, vol. II, Paris ⁴1983, pp. 296–355.
- Aretalogiae Isidis*, in *Ausgewählte Texte der Isis- und Sarapis-Religion*, hrsg. von M. Toti, Hildesheim-Zürich-New York 1985 (Subsidia Epigraphica 12).
- Aristeas, *Ad Philocratem epistula*, ed. P. Wendland, Lipsiae 1900.
- , ed. A. Pelletier, Paris 1962 (Sch 89).
- Aristobulus, in FGrHist II B (no. 139), Berlin 1929 (reprint Leiden 1986), pp. 769–799.
- Aristoteles, *Ars rhetorica*, ed. R. Kassel, Berolini-Novii Eboraci 1976.
- , *De caelo*, ed. O. Longo, Firenze 1962.
- , *Epistulae*, in *idem, Privatorum scriptorum fragmenta*, ed. M. Plezia, Leipzig 1977, pp. 7–33.
- , *Ethica Nicomachea*, ed. I. Bywater, Oxonii 1935.
- , *Fragmenta*, ed. V. Rose, Lipsiae ³1886.
- , *Fragmenta selecta*, ed. W. D. Ross, Oxonii 1955.
- , *Librorum deperditorum fragmenta*, ed. O. Gigon, Berolini-Novii Eboraci (Aristotelis Opera, vol. III).
- , *Metaphysica*, ed. W. Jaeger, Oxonii 1957.
- , *Politica*, ed. W. D. Ross, Oxonii 1957.
- , ed. A. Dreizehnter, München 1970 (*Studia et testimonia antiqua* 7).
- Arnobius, *Adversus nationes*, ed. A. Reifferscheid, Vindobonae 1875 (CSEL 4).
- , ed. C. Marchesi, Augustae Taurinorum ²1953 (*Corpus Scriptorum Latinorum Paravianum*).
- Arrianus, *Anabasis Alexandri*, edd. A. G. Roos-G. Wirth, Lipsiae ²1967.
- , *Indica*, ed. A. G. Roos, in *Arriani quae exstant omnia*, vol. II: *Scripta minora et fragmenta*, Lipsiae ²1968.
- Artapanus, in FGrHist III C (no. 726), Leiden 1958 (reprint Leiden 1969), pp. 680–686.
- , in *Fragmenta Pseudoepigraphorum quae supersunt Graeca una cum historicorum et auctorum Iudaeorum Hellenistarum fragmentis* collegit et ordinavit A.-M. Denis, Leiden 1970, pp. 204–207.

- Athanasius, *Oratio contra gentes*, ed. J.-P. Migne, Parisiis 1884 (PG 25), coll. 3–95.
- Athenaeus, *Dipnosophistae*, ed. G. Kaibel, vol. I–III, Lipsiae 1887–1890 (reprint Stuttgartiae 1985–1992).
- Athenagoras, *Legatio pro Christianis*, ed. M. Marcovich, Berlin-New York 1990 (PTS 31).
- Augustinus, *De civitate Dei*, edd. B. Dombart-A. Kalb, Turnholti 1955 (Opera XIV 1) [CCL 47].
- , *De consensu evangelistarum*, ed. F. Weihrich, Vindobonae-Lipsiae 1904 (Opera, sectio III pars 4) [CSEL 43].
- , *De vera religione*, ed. K.-D. Daur, Turnholti 1962 (CCL 32), pp. 169–260.
- , *Epistulae*, ed. A. Goldbacher, pars 1, Pragae-Vindobonae-Lipsiae 1895 (Opera, sectio II pars 1) [CSEL 34].
- , *Sermones*, ed. J.-P. Migne, Lutetiae Parisiorum 1861 (PL 38–39).
- Babrius, *Mythiambi Aesopi* (= *Fabulae*), edd. M. J. Luzzato-A. La Penna, Leipzig 1986.
- Baton, in FGrHist III A (nr 268), Leiden 1940 (Leiden ³1993), pp. 77–79.
- Berosus, [in:] FGrHist III C 1 (no. 680), Leiden 1958, pp. 364–397.
- Caecilius Statius, *Comoediae*, in *Scaenicae Romanorum Poesis Fragmenta*, vol. II: *Comicorum Romanorum praeter Plautum et Syri quae feruntur sententias fragmenta*, ed. O. Ribbeck, Lipsiae ³1898, pp. 40–94.
- , ed. T. Guardi, Palermo 1974.
- Caesar, *Bellum Gallicum*, ed. O. Seel, Leipzig ³1977.
- Ps.-Caesarius Nazianzenus, *Die Erotapokriseis*, hrsg. von R. Riedinger, Berlin 1989 (GCS).
- Callimachus, *Opera*, vol. I–II, ed. R. Pfeiffer, Oxonii 1949–1953 (reprint Oxonii 1965).
- , *Werke griechisch und deutsch*, hrsg. und übersetzt von M. Asper, Darmstadt 2004.
- Callisthenes, in FGrHist II B (no. 124), Berlin 1929 (reprint Leiden 1986), pp. 631–657.
- Ps.-Callisthenes, *Historia Alexandri Magni*, vol. I: *Recensio vetusta*, ed. W. Kroll, Hildesheim ⁴2005 (Berolini ¹1925).
- Callixinus Rhodius, in FGrHist III C (no. 627), Leiden 1958 (reprint Leiden 1967), pp. 161–178.
- Cassiodorus, *Variae*, ed. Å.J. Fridh, Turnholti 1973 (CCL 96), pp. 1–499.
- , ed. Th. Mommsen, Berolini 1894 (MGH AA 12).
- Cassius Dio, *Historiarum Romanarum quae supersunt*, ed. U.Ph. Boissevain, vol. I–III, Berolini 1895–1901.
- Cassius Hemina, in HRR I, Lipsiae ²1914, pp. 98–111.
- Castor Rhodius, in FGrHist II B (no. 250), Berlin 1929 (reprint Leiden 1986), pp. 1130–1145.
- Cedrenus, *Compendium historiarum*, ed. J.-P. Migne, Lutetiae Parisiorum 1864 (PG 121), coll. 23–1166.
- Cephalon, in FGrHist II A (no. 93), Berlin 1926 (reprint Leiden 1986), pp. 436–445.
- Certamen Homeri et Hesiodi*, in *Homeric Hymns, Homeric Apocrypha, Lives of Homer*, ed. M.L. West, Cambridge, Mass.-London 2003 (LCL 496), pp. 318–353.
- Charax, in FGrHist II A (no. 103), Berlin 1926 (reprint Leiden 1986), pp. 482–493.
- Chares, in FGrHist II B (no. 125), Berlin 1929 (reprint Leiden 1986), pp. 657–665.
- Chronicon Paschale*, edd. L. Dindorf, J.-P. Migne, Lutetiae Parisiorum 1865 (PG 92), coll. 67–1028.
- Chrysippus, in SVF III, Lipsiae 1903, pp. 1–205.
- Cicero, *Consolatio* in Cicero, *Scripta quae manserunt omnia*, ed. C.F.W. Müller, Pars IV, vol. III, Lipsiae 1904, pp. 332–338.
- , *De divinatione*, ed. R. Giomini, Leipzig 1975.
- , *De finibus bonorum et malorum*, ed. Th. Schiche, Stuttgartiae-Lipsiae 1993 (¹1915) [Scripta quae manserunt omnia, fasc. 43].
- , *De legibus*, ed. K. Ziegler, Heidelberg 1950.

- , *De natura deorum*, edd. O. Plasberg, W. Ax, Lipsiae 1933 (Scripta quae manserunt omnia, fasc. 45) [reprint Stuttgartiae 1968].
- , *De oratore*, ed. K. Kumaniecki, Lipsiae 1969.
- , *De re publica*, ed. K. Ziegler, Leipzig ⁷1969 (Scripta quae manserunt omnia, fasc. 39).
- , *Epistulae ad Atticum*, in *idem, Epistulae*, vol. II, ed. W.S. Watt, Oxonii 1965.
- , *Oratio cum populo gratias egit*, in *idem, Orationes post reditum*, ed. T. Maslowski, Leipzig 1981 (Scripta quae manserunt omnia, fasc. 21), pp. 20–32.
- , *Oratio cum senatui gratias egit*, in *idem, Orationes post reditum*, ed. T. Maslowski (...), pp. 1–19.
- , *Pro P. Sestio*, ed. A. Klotz, Lipsiae 1915 (Scripta quae manserunt omnia, fasc. 22).
- , *Pro Q. Ligario*, ed. A. Klotz, Lipsiae 1914 (Scripta quae manserunt omnia, fasc. 27).
- , *Tusculanae disputationes*, ed. M. Pohlenz, Lipsiae 1918 (Scripta quae manserunt omnia, fasc. 44) [reprint Stuttgartiae 1982].
- Claudianus, *Carmina*, ed. J. B. Hall, Leipzig 1985.
- Clearchus, *Fragmenta*, ed. F. Wehrli, Basel-Stuttgart ²1969 (Die Schule des Aristoteles 3).
- Clemens Alexandrinus, *Protrepticus*, edd. O. Stählin-U. Treu, Berlin ³1972 (GCS).
- , ed. M. Marcovich, Leiden-New York-Köln 1995 (Supplements to Vigiliae Christianae, vol. 34).
- , *Stromata*, I. I–VI, edd. O. Stählin-L. Früchtel-U. Treu, Berlin ⁴1985 (GCS).
- Ps.-Clemens Romanus, *Epistula 2 ad Corinthios*, in *Die Apostolischen Väter*, hrsg. von F.X. Funk, Tübingen ²1906 (Sammlung ausgewählter kirchen-und dogmengeschichtlicher Quellenschriften. Zweite Reihe. Erstes Heft), pp. 69–79.
- , *Homiliae*, edd. B. Rehm, F. Paschke, Berlin ²1969 (GCS 42²).
- , *Recognitiones*, ed. B. Rehm, Berlin 1965 (GCS 51).
- Clitarchus, in FGrHist II B (no. 137), Berlin 1929 (reprint Leiden 1986), pp. 741–752.
- Columella, *Res rustica*, ed. Å. Josephson, Upsaliae 1955 (Collectio scriptorum veterum Upsaliensis).
- Commenta Bernensia ad Lucanum*, ed. H. Usener, Lipsiae 1869.
- Commodianus, *Instructiones*, in *idem, Carmina*, ed. I. Martin, Turnholti 1960 (CCL 128), pp. 1–70.
- Cosmas Hierosolymitanus, *Collectio et interpretatio historiarum quarum meminit divus Gregorius Theologus*, ed. J.-P. Migne, Lutetiae Parisiorum 1862 (PG 38), coll. 339–670.
- Cosmas Indicopleustes, *Topographia christiana*, ed. W. Wolska-Conus, Paris 1968–1973 (Sch 141, 159, 197).
- Critias, in DK II (no. 88), Zürich-Hildesheim 1992 (⁶1952), pp. 371–399.
- , in TrGF, I, Göttingen ²1986, pp. 170–184.
- Ctesias, in FGrHist III C 1 (no. 688), Leiden 1958, pp. 416–517.
- , in *Ctésias de Cnide, La Perse, l'Inde, autres fragments*, Texte établi et commenté par D. Lenfant, Paris 2004.
- Curtius Rufus, *Historia Alexandri Magni*, ed. C.M. Lucarini, Berolini-Novi Eboraci 2009.
- Cyprianus, *Quod idola dii non sint*, in Cyprianus, *Opera omnia*, ed. W. Hartel, Vindobonae 1868 (CSEL III 1), pp. 19–31.
- Cyranides*, ed. D. Kaimakis, Meisenheim am Glan 1976 (Beiträge zur klassischen Philologie 76).
- Cyrellus Alexandrinus, *Contra Iulianum*, edd. J. Aubert-J.P. Migne, Lutetiae Parisiorum 1859 (PG 76), coll. 490–1064.
- Damascius, *Commentaria in Platonis Philebum*, ed. L.G. Westerink, Amsterdam 1959.

- , *Dubitationes et solutiones de primis principiis in Platonis Parmenidem*, ed. C.Ae. Ruelle, Parisiis 1889.
- Ps.-Demetrius Phalereus, *De elocutione*, ed. L. Radermacher, Lipsiae 1901 (reprint Stuttgartiae 1967).
- Democritus Abderites, in DK II (no. 68), Zürich-Hildesheim 1992 (Berlin ⁶1952), pp. 81–230.
- Demosthenes, *Orationes*, ed. M.R. Dils, vol. I–IV, Oxonii 2002–2009.
- De viris illustribus Urbis Romae*, in Aurelius Victor, *Liber de Caesaribus*, edd. F. Pichlmayr, R. Gruendel, Lipsiae 1966, pp. 23–74.
- Diagoras Melius, in Diagoras Melius et Theodorus Cyrenaeus, *Reliquiae*, ed. M. Winarczyk, Leipzig 1981, pp. 1–30.
- Dicaearchus, *Fragmenta*, ed. F. Wehrli, Basel-Stuttgart ²1967 (Die Schule des Aristoteles 1).
- , *The Sources*, ed. D.C. Mirhady, in W.W. Fortenbaugh-E. Schütrumpf (eds), *Dicaearchus of Messana. Text, Translation, and Discussion*, New Brunswick-London 2001 (Rutgers University Studies in Classical Humanities 10), pp. 1–142.
- Didache*, ed. H. Lietzmann, Bonn ³1912 (Texte für Vorlesungen und Übungen 6).
- , edd. W. Rordorf, A. Tuilier, Paris 1978 (SCh 248).
- Dinarchus Delius, in FGrHist III B (no. 399), Leiden 1950 (Leiden ³1993), pp. 292–293.
- Dinarchus, *Orationes*, ed. N.C. Conomis, Leipzig 1975.
- Dio Chrysostomus, *Quae exstant omnia*, ed. H. von Arnim, vol. I–II, Hildesheim ³2000 (Berolini ¹1893–1896).
- Diodorus Siculus, *Bibliotheca historica*, edd. F. Vogel, C.Th. Fischer, vol. I–V, Lipsiae 1888–1906.
- Diogenes Laertius, *Vitae philosophorum*, ed. H. S. Long, vol. I–II, Oxonii 1964.
- , ed. M. Marcovich, vol. I–II, Stuttgartiae-Lipsiae 1999.
- Diogenes Sinopensis, *Testimonia et Fragmenta*, in SSR, vol. II, Napoli 1990, pp. 227–509.
- Diogenianus, *Proverbia*, in CPG I, Gottingae 1839 (reprint Hildesheim 1958), pp. 177–320.
- Dionysius Halicarnasseus, *Antiquitates Romanae*, ed. C. Jacoby, vol. I–IV, Lipsiae 1885–1905.
- Dionysius Periegetes, *Orbis descriptio*, ed. C. Müller, in GGM II, Parisiis 1861, pp. 103–176.
- Dionysius Scytobrachion, *Testimonia et Fragmenta*, ed. J.S. Rusten, Opladen 1982 (Papyrologica Coloniensia 10).
- Dioscurides, *De materia medica*, ed. M. Wellmann, vol. I–III, Berolini 1906–1914.
- Dosiades, in FGrHist III B (no. 458), Leiden 1950 (Leiden ³1993), pp. 394–396.
- Ps.-Dositheus (=Hermeneumata Stephani), in *Corpus Glossariorum Latinorum*, vol. III: *Hermeneumata Pseudodositheana*, ed. G. Goetz, Leipzig 1892, pp. 345–390.
- Duris, in FGrHist II A (no. 76), Berlin 1926 (reprint Leiden 1986), pp. 136–158.
- Empedocles, in DK I (no. 31), Zürich-Hildesheim 1992 (Berlin ⁶1951), pp. 276–375.
- , *Fragmenta*, ed. B. Inwood, Toronto-Buffalo-London 2001 (Phoenix suppl. 39).
- Ennius, *Reliquiae*, ed. J. Vahlen, Lipsiae ²1903 (reprint Lipsiae 1928 and Amsterdam 1963).
- , *Tragediae*, ed. H.D. Jocelyn, Cambridge 1967 (Cambridge Classical Texts and Commentaries 10).
- Ephorus, in FGrHist II A (no. 70), Berlin 1926 (Leiden 1986), pp. 37–109.
- Epicurea*, ed. H. Usener, Lipsiae 1887 (reprint Stuttgart 1966).
- Epicurus, *Opera*, ed. G. Arrighetti, Torino ²1973.
- Epimenides, in FGrHist III B (no. 457), Leiden 1950 (Leiden ³1993), pp. 384–394.
- , in *Poetae Epici Graeci*, ed. A. Bernabé, pars. II, fasc. 3, Berolini-Novii Eboraci 2007, pp. 105–168.

- Epiphanius, *Ancoratus*, ed. K. Holl, Leipzig 1915 (GCS 25), pp. 1–149.
- , *Panarion*, ed. K. Holl, Leipzig 1915–1933 (GCS 25, 31, 37).
- Epistula ad Diognetum*, ed. J. Geffcken, Heidelberg 1928 (Kommentierte Griechische und Lateinische Texte 4).
- , ed. H.I. Marrou, Paris 1951 (Sch 33) [Paris 1965 (Sch 33 bis)].
- Eratosthenes, *Die geographischen Fragmente*, hrsg. v. H. Berger, Leipzig 1880 (reprint Amsterdam 1964).
- Etymologicum Magnum*, ed. T. Gaisford, Oxford 1848 (reprint Amsterdam 1967).
- Ps.-Eudocia, *Violarium*, ed. H. Flach, Lipsiae 1880.
- Euphorio Chalcidensis, *Opera*, ed. B.A. van Groningen, Amsterdam 1977.
- , in *Collectanea Alexandrina*, ed. I.U. Powell, Oxonii 1925 (reprint 1970), pp. 28–58.
- Eupolemus, in FGrHist III C (no. 723), Leiden 1958 (reprint Leiden 1969), pp. 671–678.
- , in *Fragmenta Pseudoepigraphorum quae supersunt Graeca una cum historicorum et auctorum Iudaeorum Hellenistarum fragmentis* collegit et ordinavit A.-M. Denis, Leiden 1970, pp. 179–186.
- Ps.-Eupolemus, in FGrHist III C (no. 724), Leiden 1958 (reprint Leiden 1969), pp. 678–679.
- , in *Fragmenta Pseudoepigraphorum* (...), pp. 197–198.
- Eupolis, *Comoediae*, in PCG V, Berolini-Novi Eboraci 1986, pp. 294–539.
- Euripides, *Fabulae*, ed. J. Diggle, vol. I–III, Oxonii 1981–1994.
- Eusebius, *Die Chronik*. Aus dem Armenischen übersetzt, hrsg. von J. Karst, Leipzig 1911, (GCS 20).
- , *Hieronymi Chronicon*, ed. R. Helm, Berlin ²1956 (GCS 47).
- , *Praeparatio evangelica*, edd. K. Mras-É. des Places, vol. I-II, Berlin ²1982–²1983 (GCS. Eusebius Werke VIII 1–2).
- Eustathius, *Commentarii ad Homeri Iliadem pertinentes*, ed. M. van der Valk, vol. I–IV, Lugduni Batavorum 1971–1987.
- , *Commentarii ad Homeri Odysseam*, ed. G. Stallbaum, t. I, Lipsiae 1825 (reprint Hildesheim 1960).
- , *Commentarii in Dionysii Orbis descriptionem*, ed. C. Müller, in GGM II, Parisiis 1861, pp. 201–407.
- Expositio totius mundi et gentium*, ed. J. Rougé, Paris 1966 (Sch 124).
- Ezechiel, in TrGF I, Göttingen ²1986, pp. 288–301.
- Festus, *De verborum significatu*, in *Glossaria Latina*, ed. W.M. Lindsay, t. IV, Paris 1930 (reprint Hildesheim 1965), pp. 91–467.
- Firmicus Maternus, *De errore profanarum religionum*, ed. A. Pastorino, Firenze 1956 (Biblioteca di Studi Superiori 27).
- Fragmenta Poetarum Latinorum Epicorum et Lyricorum. Praeter Enni Annales et Ciceronis Germanicique Aratea*. Post W. Morell et K. Büchner editionem quartam auctam curavit J. Blänsdorf, Berlin-Boston 2011.
- Fulgentius, *Expositio sermonum antiquorum*, in *idem, Opera*, ed. R. Helm, Lipsiae 1898, pp. 109–126.
- Galenus, *Protrepticus*, ed. G. Kaibel, Berolini ²1963 (¹1894).
- Ps.-Galenus, *Historia philosopha*, in *Doxographi Graeci*. Collegit, recensuit prolegomenis indicibusque instruxit H. Diels, Berolini 1879 (⁴1965), pp. 595–648.
- Gellius, *Noctes Atticae*, ed. P. K. Marshall, vol. I–II, Oxonii 1968.
- Georgius Monachus, *Chronicon breve*, edd. E. de Muralto, J.-P. Migne, Lutetiae Parisiorum 1863 (PG 110).
- Gnomologium Vaticanum*, ed. L. Sternbach, Berlin 1963 (Texte und Kommentare 2).
- Gorgon, in FGrHist III B (no. 515), Leiden 1950 (Leiden ³1993), pp. 490–491.
- Gotifredus Viterbiensis, *Speculum regum*, ed. G. Waitz, Hannoverae 1872 (MGH SS 22), pp. 21–93.
- Gregorius Nazianzenus, *Orationes*, ed. J.-P. Migne, Lutetiae Parisiorum 1852 (PG 35).
- Gregorius Nyssenus, *In inscriptiones Psalmorum*, ed. J. McDonough, Leiden 1962 (*Opera*, t. V), pp. 24–175.

- Gregorius Turonensis, *Historia Francorum*, ed. W. Arndt, Hannoverae 1884 (MGH Scr. Rer. Mer. I 1).
- Harpocration, *Lexicon in decem oratores Atticos*, ed. J.J. Keaney, Amsterdam 1991.
- Hecataeus Abderites, in FGrHist III A (no. 264), Leiden 1940, pp. 11–64.
- Hecataeus Milesius, in FGrHist I A (no. 1), Leiden ²1957 (reprint Leiden-New York-Köln 1995), pp. 1–47.
- , in R.L. Fowler, *Early Greek Mythographers*, I: *Texts*, Oxford 2000, pp. 110–146.
- Hellanicus, in FGrHist I A (no. 4), Leiden ²1957 (reprint Leiden-New York-Köln 1995), pp. 104–152.
- , in R.L. Fowler, *Early Greek Mythography*, I: *Texts*, Oxford 2000, pp. 147–231.
- Heraclides Ponticus, *Fragmenta*, ed. F. Wehrli, Basel-Stuttgart ²1969 (Die Schule des Aristoteles 7).
- Heraclitus Ephesius, in DK I (no. 22), Zürich-Hildesheim 1992 (Berlin ⁶1951), pp. 139–190.
- , *Fragmenta*, ed. M. Marcovich, Sankt Augustin ²2001 (International Pre-Platonic Studies 2).
- Hermippus, *Testimonia et Fragmenta*, ed. F. Wehrli, Basel-Stuttgart 1974 (Die Schule des Aristoteles. Suppl. 1).
- , in FGrHist IV A 3 (no. 1026), ed. J. Bollansée, Leiden 1999.
- Herodorus, in FGrHist I A (no. 31), Leiden ²1957 (reprint Leiden-New York-Köln 1995), pp. 215–228.
- , in R.L. Fowler, *Early Greek Mythography*, I: *Texts*, Oxford 2000, pp. 232–257.
- Herodotus, *Historiae*, ed. C. Hude, Oxonii 1908 (many reprints).
- , ed. H.B. Rosén, vol. I, Leipzig 1987; vol. II, Stutgardiae-Lipsiae 1997.
- Heronidas, *Mimiambi*, ed. I.C. Cunningham, Leipzig 1987.
- Hesiodus, *Fragmenta*, edd. R. Merkelbach-M. L. West, Oxonii 1967 (reprint Oxonii 1999).
- , *Theogonia*, ed. M.L. West, Oxford 1966.
- Hesychius, *Lexicon*, vol. I-II (A–O), ed. K. Latte, Hauniae 1953–1966.
- , *Lexicon*, vol. IV (T–Ω), edd. P.A. Hansen, I.C. Cunningham, Berlin-New York 2009 (Sammlung griechischer und lateinischer Grammatiker XI 4).
- Hieronymus, *Commentarii in epistulam Pauli ad Titum*, ed. F. Bucchi, Turnhout 2003 (CCL 77 C), pp. 1–73.
- , *Commentarii in Esaia prophetam*, ed. M. Adriaen, Turnholti 1963 (CCL 73, 73 A).
- , *Commentarii in Matheum*, edd. D. Hurst, M. Adriaen, Turnholti 1969 (CCL 77).
- , *De viris illustribus*, ed. E. Richardson, Leipzig 1896 (TU XIV 1).
- , *Epistulae*, ed. I. Hilberg, vol. I, Vindobonae-Lipsiae 1910 (CSEL 54).
- Hippodamus, in DK I (no. 39), Berlin ⁶1951 (reprint Zürich-Hildesheim 1992), pp. 389–391.
- Homerus, *Ilias*, ed. H. van Thiel, Hildesheim-Zürich-New York 1996 (Bibliotheca Weidmanniana 2).
- , ed. M. L. West, vol. I-II, Stutgardiae-Lipsiae 1998.
- , *Odyssea*, ed. H. van Thiel, Hildesheim-Zürich-New York 1991 (Bibliotheca Weidmanniana 1).
- Horatius, *Opera*, ed. S. Borzsák, Leipzig 1984.
- , ed. D. R. Shackleton Bailey, Stutgardiae ³1995.
- Hrabanus Maurus, *De universo*, ed. J.-P. Migne, Lutetiae Parisiorum 1852 (PL 111), coll. 9–614.
- Hyginus, *De astronomia*, ed. A. Le Boeuffe, Paris 1983.
- , *Fabulae*, ed. P.K. Marshall, Monachii-Lipsiae 2002.
- Hyginus, in HRR II, Lipsiae 1906, pp. 72–77.
- Hymni Homerici*, ed. F. Càssola, Milano 1994 (Classici Greci e Latini 75).

- Hymnus in Iovem Dictaeum*, in W.D. Furley, J.M. Bremer, *Greek Hymns*, vol. II, Tübingen 2001 (Studien und Texte zu Antike und Christentum 10), pp. 1–20.
- Hyperides, *Orationes*, ed. F.G. Kenyon, Oxonii 1906.
- Iamblichus, *De mysteriis*, ed. É. des Places, Paris 1966.
- , *Vita Pythagorae*, ed. M. von Albrecht, Darmstadt 2002 (SAPERE 4), pp. 32–218.
- Ioannes Antiochenus, *Historia*, FHG IV, Parisiis 1880, pp. 535–622.
- , *Fragmenta ex Historia chronica*, ed. U. Roberto, Berlin-New York 2005 (TU 154).
- , *Fragmenta quae supersunt omnia*, ed. S. Mariev, Berolini-Novii Eboraci 2008 (CFHB 47).
- Ioannes Chrysostomus, *Homiliae VI in epistulam ad Titum*, ed. J.-P. Migne, Lutetiae Parisiorum 1862 (PG 62), coll. 663–700.
- , *Homiliae XXX in epistulam secundam ad Corinthios*, ed. J.-P. Migne, Lutetiae Parisiorum 1862 (PG 61), coll. 381–610.
- Ioannes Lydus, *De mensibus*, ed. R. Wuensch, Lipsiae 1898 (reprint Stuttgart 1967)
- Ioannes Malalas, *Chronographia*, ed. J. Thurn, Berolini-Novii Eboraci 2000 (CFHB 35).
- Iosephus, *Antiquitates Iudaicae*, ed. B. Niese, Berolini 1887–1892 (Opera, vol. I–III).
- , *Bellum Iudaicum*, ed. B. Niese, Berolini 1894 (Opera, vol. VI).
- , *Contra Apionem*, ed. B. Niese, Berolini 1889 (Opera, vol. V).
- Isidorus, *Etymologiae sive Origines*, ed. W.M. Lindsay, vol. I–II, Oxonii 1911.
- Isocrates, *Opera omnia*, ed. B.G. Mandilaras, vol. I–III, Monachii-Lipsiae 2003.
- Iulianus, *Misopogon*, in Iulianus, *Opera*, ed. W.C. Wright, vol. III, Cambridge, Mass.-London 1969 (¹1913) [LCL 29], pp. 417–511.
- Iustinus, *Apologiae pro Christianis*, ed. M. Marcovich, Berlin-New York 2005 (PTS 38) [¹1994].
- , *Dialogus cum Tryphone*, ed. M. Marcovich, Berlin-New York 2005 (PTS 47) [¹1997].
- Iustinus, *Epitoma Historiarum Philippicarum Pompei Trogi*, ed. O. Seel, Stutgardiae ²1972.
- Korē Kosmou (=Pupilla mundi), in *Corpus Hermeticum*, ed. A.D. Nock, vol. IV, Paris 1972, p. 21.
- Lactantius, *De ave Phoenixe*, ed. S. Brandt, Pragae-Vindobonae-Lipsiae 1893 (Opera, pars II fasc. 1) [CSEL 27].
- , *De ira Dei*, ed. S. Brandt, Pragae-Vindobonae-Lipsiae 1893 (CSEL 27).
- , *Divinae institutiones*, ed. S. Brandt, Pragae-Vindobonae-Lipsiae 1890 (Opera, pars I) [CSEL 19].
- , edd. E. Heck, A. Wlosok, fasc. 1: libri I–II, Monachii-Lipsiae 2005; fasc. 2: Libri III–IV, Berolini-Novii Eboraci 2007; fasc. 3: Libri V–VI, Berolini-Novii Eboraci 2009.
- , *Epitome divinarum institutionum*, edd. E. Heck, A. Wlosok, Stutgardiae-Lipsiae 1994.
- Lactantius Placidus, *In Statii Thebaida commentum*, ed. R.D. Sweeney, vol. I, Stutgardiae-Lipsiae 1997.
- Leon Pellaeus, in FGrHist III C 1 (no. 659), Leiden 1958, pp. 208–211.
- Libanius, *Orationes XII–XXV*, ed. R. Foerster, vol. II, Lipsiae 1904
- Linus, in *Poetae Epici Graeci*, ed. A. Bernabé, pars II, fasc. 3, Berolini-Novii Eboraci 2007, pp. 56–104.
- Livius, *Ab Urbe condita*, libri XXVI–XXVII, ed. P.G. Walsh, Leipzig 1982.
- Longus, *Daphnis et Chloe*, ed. M.D. Reeve, Leipzig 1986 (³1994).
- Lucanus, *De bello civili (Pharsalia)*, ed. D.R. Shackleton Bailey, Stutgardiae ²1997.
- Lucianus, *Opera*, ed. M.D. Macleod, vol. I–IV, Oxonii 1972–1987.
- Lucretius, *De rerum natura*, ed. J. Martin, Lipsiae ⁵1969.

- Macrobius, *Commentarii in somnium Scipionis*, ed. J. Willis, Leipzig 1970 (Opera, vol. II).
- , *Saturnalia*, ed. J. Willis, Lipsiae 1963 (³1994) [Opera, vol. I].
- Manetho, in FGrHist III C 1 (no. 609), Leiden 1958, pp. 5–112.
- Manilius, *Astronomica*, ed. G.P. Goold, Stutgardiae-Lipsiae ²1998.
- Marcianus, *Epitome peripli maris interni quem tribus libris scripsit Menippus Pergamenus*, in GGM I, Parisiis 1855, pp. 563–573.
- Martianus Capella, *De nuptiis Philologiae et Mercurii*, ed. J. Willis, Leipzig 1983.
- Martialis, *Epigrammata*, edd. W. Heraeus, I. Borovskij, Leipzig ³1982.
- Martinus Bracarensis, *De correctione rusticorum*, ed. C.P. Caspari, Christiania 1883.
- , ed. M. Naldini, Firenze 1991.
- Martyrium Romanum S. Ignatii*, in *Patres Apostolici*, edd. F.X. Funk, F. Diekamp, vol. II, Tübingen ³1913, pp. 340–362.
- Martyrium S. Philippi et sociorum*, in *Acta Sanctorum*, edd. J. van Hecke *et al.*, vol. IX, Parisiis-Romae 1869, pp. 545–553.
- Maximus Tyrius, *Dissertationes*, ed. M.B. Trapp, Stutgardiae-Lipsiae 1994.
- Megasthenes, in FGrHist III C 2 (no. 715), Leiden 1958, pp. 603–639.
- Mela, *De chorographia*, ed. G. Ranstrand, Göteborg 1971 (Studia Graeca et Latina Gothoburgensia 28).
- Ps.-Meliton, *An Oration of Meliton the Philosopher*, in *Specilegium Syriacum Containing Remains of Bardesan, Meliton, Ambrose and Mara Bar Serapion*. Now first edited with an English translation and notes by W. Cureton, London 1855, pp. 41–51.
- Memnon, in FGrHist III B (no. 434), Leiden 1950 (Leiden ³1993), pp. 336–368.
- Michael Psellus, ἀλληγορία εἰς τὸν Τάνταλον, in *idem, Philosophica minora*, vol. I: *Opuscula logica, physica, allegorica, alia*, ed. J.M. Duffy, Stutgardiae-Lipsiae 1992, pp. 153–157 (opusc. 43).
- Minucius Felix, *Octavius*, ed. B. Kytzler, Leipzig 1982 (²1992).
- Mythographi Vaticani I et II*, ed. P. Kulcsár, Turnholti 1987 (CCL 91 C).
- The Nag Hammadi Library in English*. General Editor J. M. Robinson, Leiden-New York-Köln ⁴1996.
- Naupactia in Epicorum Graecorum Fragmenta*, ed. M. Davies, Göttingen 1988, pp. 145–149.
- Nearchus, in FGrHist II B (no. 133), Berlin 1929 (reprint Leiden 1986), pp. 677–772.
- Nepos, *Vitae cum fragmentis*, ed. P.K. Marshall, Leipzig 1977.
- Nicolaus Damascenus, in FGrHist II A (no. 90), Berlin 1926 (reprint Leiden 1986), pp. 324–430.
- Nonnus Abbas, *Collectio et expositio historiarum quarum S.P.N. Gregorius meminit in priore invectiva Adversus Julianum Imp.*, ed. J.-P. Migne, Lutetiae Parisiorum 1852 (PG 36), coll. 985–1072.
- Nonnus Panopolitanus, *Dionysiaca*, ed. R. Keydell, vol. I-II, Berolini 1959.
- Novum Testamentum Graece et Latine*, ed. Eberhard Nestle. Novis curis elaboraverunt Erwin Nestle, K. Aland, London ²²1969.
- , edd. K. Aland, M. Black, C.M. Martini, B.M. Metzger, A. Wikgren. New York-London-Edinburg-Amsterdam-Stuttgart ²1968.
- Onesicritus, in FGrHist II B (no. 134), Berlin 1929 (reprint Leiden 1986), pp. 723–736.
- Oracula Sibyllina*, ed. J. Geffcken, Leipzig 1902.
- , *Griechisch-deutsch*. Auf der Grundlage der Ausgabe von A. Kurfeß neu übersetzt und herausgegeben von J.-D. Gauger, Darmstadt 1998 (Sammlung Tusculum).
- Origenes, *Contra Celsum*, ed. P. Koetschau, Leipzig 1899 (GCS).
- , *Exhortatio ad martyrium*, ed. P. Koetschau, Leipzig 1899 (GCS), pp. 1–47.
- , *Homiliae in Jeremiam*, ed. E. Klostermann, Leipzig 1901 (GCS).
- Origo gentis Romanae*, in Aurelius Victor, *Liber de Caesaribus*, edd. F. Pichlmayr, R. Gruendel, Lipsiae 1966, pp. 1–22.

- Ovidius, *Amores*, ed. J. C. McKeown, Liverpool-New Hampshire 1987 (ARCA 20).
 —, *Fasti*, edd. D.E.W. Wormell, E.H. Alton, E. Courtney, Stuttgart-Lipsiae 1990.
 —, *Metamorphoses*, ed. W. S. Anderson, Leipzig ³1985.
 Palaephatus, Περὶ ἀπίστων, ed. N. Festa, Lipsiae 1902 (Mythographi Graeci III 2), pp. 1–72.
 Paulinus Nolanus, *Carmina*, ed. W. Hartel, Pragae-Vindobonae-Lipsiae 1894 (CSEL 30).
 Pausanias, *Graeciae descriptio*, ed. M.H. Rocha-Pereira, vol. I–III, Leipzig ²1989–²1990.
 P. Berol. 21243, ed. W. M. Brashear, ZPE 33, 1979, pp. 261–278.
 P. Cairo Zenon 59355, in *Zenon Papyri*, ed. C. C. Edgar, vol. III, Le Caire 1931.
Periplus Ponti Euxini, in GGM I, Parisiis 1855, pp. 402–423.
 Persaeus Citieus, in SVF I, Lipsiae 1905, pp. 96–102.
 Petrus Comestor, *Historia scholastica*, ed. J.-P. Migne, Lutetiae Parisiorum 1855 (PL 198), coll. 1053–1644.
 P. Herc. 1428, ed. A. Henrichs, CrErc 4, 1974, pp. 5–32.
 Pherecydes Atheniensis, in FGrHist I A (no. 3), Leiden ²1957 (reprint Leiden-New York-Köln 1995), pp. 58–104.
 —, in R.L. Fowler, *Early Greek Mythography*, I: *Texts*, Oxford 2000, pp. 272–364.
 Pherecydes Syrius, *Testimonia et fragmenta*, in H.S. Schibli, *Pherekydes of Syros*, Oxford 1990, pp. 140–179.
 P. Hibeh 2. 186, in *The Hibeh Papyri*, ed. E. G. Turner, vol. II, London 1955, pp. 53–57.
 Philo Alexandrinus, *De vita Mosis*, in *idem, Opera quae supersunt*, vol. IV, ed. L. Cohn, Berolini 1902, pp. 119–268.
 —, *Legatio ad Gaium*, in *idem, Opera quae supersunt*, vol. VI, edd. L. Cohn, S. Reiter, Berolini 1915, pp. 155–223.
 Philo Byblius, in FGrHist III C 2 (no. 790), Leiden 1958, pp. 802–824.
 Philochorus, in FGrHist III B (no. 328), Leiden 1950 (reprint Leiden ³1993), pp. 97–160.
 Philodemus, *De pietate*, ed. Th. Gomperz, Leipzig 1866 (Herkulanische Studien 2).
 —, *De pietate pars prior*, ed. A. Schober, CrErc 18, 1988, pp. 67–125 (= unpublished dissertation Königsberg 1923).
 —, *De pietate*, pars I, ed. D. Obbink, Oxford 1996.
 Philostratus, *Vita Apollonii*, ed. C.L. Kayser, Lipsiae 1870 (Opera, vol. I) [reprint Hildesheim-Zürich-New York 1985].
 —, *Vitae sophistarum*, ed. C.L. Kayser, Lipsiae 1871 (Opera, vol. II) [reprint Hildesheim-Zürich-New York 1985].
 Photius, *Bibliotheca*, ed. R. Henry, t. I–VIII, Paris 1959–1977.
 Pindarus, *Carmina*, pars I: *Epinicia*, edd. B. Snell, H. Maehler, Leipzig ⁸1987.
 Plato, *Critias*, ed. A. Rivaud, Paris ⁴1963 (Opera, t. X).
 —, *Leges*, ed. J. Burnet, Oxonii 1907 (Opera, t. V).
 —, *Phaedrus*, ed. L. Robin, Paris ⁷1970 (Opera, t. IV 3).
 —, *Philebus*, ed. A. Diès, Paris ⁴1966 (Opera, t. IX 2).
 —, *Protagoras*, edd. A. Croiset, L. Bodin, Paris ⁵1955 (Opera, t. III 1).
 —, *Respublica*, ed. S. R. Slings, Oxonii 2003.
 —, *Symposium*, ed. L. Robert, Paris ⁸1966 (Opera t. IV 2).
 —, *Timaeus*, ed. A. Rivaud, Paris ⁴1963 (Opera, t. X).
 Ps.-Plato, *Epinomis*, edd. A. Diès, É. des Places, Paris ²1976 (Opera, t. XII 2).
 —, *Minos*, ed. J. Souilhé, Paris ²1962 (Opera, t. XIII 2).
 Plautus, *Comoediae*, ed. W.M. Lindsay, vol. I–II, Oxonii ²1910.
 Plinius Maior, *Naturalis historia*, edd. L. Ian, C. Mayhoff, vol. I–VI, Lipsiae 1892–1909.
 Plutarchus, *Aetia Graeca*, ed. J.B. Titchener, Lipsiae 1935 (²1971) [Moralia, vol. II, fasc. 1].
 —, *Alexander*, edd. K. Ziegler, H. Gärtner, Stuttgart-Lipsiae ³1994 (Vitae parallelae, vol. II 2).

- , *Amatorius*, ed. C. Hubert, Lipsiae 1938 (reprint 1971) [Moralia, vol. IV].
- , Cleomenes, edd. K. Ziegler, H. Gärtner, Stutgardiae-Lipsiae ³1996 (Vitae parallelae, vol. III 1).
- , *De Alexandri Magni fortuna aut virtute or. I et II*, ed. W. Nachstädt, Leipzig ²1971 (Moralia, vol. II).
- , *De Daedalibus Plataeensisibus*, ed. F.H. Sandbach, Lipsiae 1967 (Moralia, vol. VII).
- , *De defectu oraculorum*, ed. W. Sieveking, Leipzig ²1972 (Moralia, vol. III).
- , *De Iside et Osiride*, ed. J. G. Griffiths, Cardiff 1970.
- , ed. W. Sieveking, Leipzig ²1971 (Moralia, vol. II).
- , *Demetrius*, edd. K. Ziegler, H. Gärtner, Stutgardiae-Lipsiae 1996 (Vitae parallelae, vol. III 1).
- , *De stoicorum repugnantiis*, edd. M. Pohlenz, R. Westman, Lipsiae ²1959 (Moralia, vol. VI 2).
- , *De superstitione*, edd. W.R. Paton, I. Wegehaupt, H. Gärtner, Leipzig ²1974 (Moralia, vol. I).
- , *Dion*, edd. K. Ziegler, H. Gärtner, Stutgardiae-Lipsiae ³1993 (Vitae, vol. II, fasc. 1).
- , *Flaminius*, edd. K. Ziegler, H. Gärtner, Stutgardiae-Lipsiae ³1994 (Vitae, vol. II, fasc. 2).
- , *Lycurgus*, ed. K. Ziegler, Leipzig ²1973 (Vitae parallelae, vol. III 2).
- , *Lysander*, ed. K. Ziegler, Leipzig ²1973 (Vitae parallelae, vol. III 2).
- , *Pericles*, edd. K. Ziegler, H. Gärtner, Stutgardiae-Lipsiae ⁴1994 (Vitae parallelae, vol. I 2).
- , *Praecepta gerendae rei publicae*, edd. C. Hubert, M. Pohlenz, H. Drexler, Lipsiae ²1960 (Moralia, vol. V 1).
- , *Quaestiones convivales*, ed. C. Hubert, Lipsiae 1938 (Moralia, vol. IV).
- , *Romulus*, ed. K. Ziegler, Leipzig ⁴1969 (Vitae parallelae, vol. I 1).
- , *Septem sapientium convivium*, edd. W.R. Paton, I. Wegehaupt, H. Gärtner, Leipzig ²1974 (Moralia, vol. I).
- , *Theseus*, ed. K. Ziegler, Leipzig ⁴1969 (Vitae parallelae, vol. I, fasc. 1).
- Ps.-Plutarchus, *Apophthegmata Laconica*, ed. W. Nachstädt, Leipzig ²1971 (Moralia, vol. II).
- , *Placita philosophorum*, ed. J. Mau, Leipzig 1971 (Moralia, vol. V, fasc. 2, pars 1).
- , *Xoratorum vitae*, ed. J. Mau, Leipzig 1971 (Moralia, vol. V, fasc. 2, pars 1).
- Pollux, *Onomasticon*, ed. E. Bethe, vol. I-II, Lipsiae 1900–1931 (Lexicographi Graeci 9).
- Polyaenus, *Strategemata*, edd. E. Woelfflin, J. Melber, Lipsiae 1887.
- Polybius, *Historiae*, ed. Th. Büttner-Wobst, vol. I-V, Lipsiae 1889–1905.
- Porphyrus, *Commentum in Horatium Flaccum*, ed. A. Holder, Ad Aeni Pontem 1894 (Scholia antiqua in Q. Horatium Flaccum, vol. I).
- Porphyrus, in FGrHist II B (no. 260), Berlin 1929 (reprint Leiden 1986), pp. 1197–1229.
- , *Ad Marcellam*, in *idem, Opuscula selecta*, ed. A. Nauck, Lipsiae ²1886, pp. 271–297.
- , *De abstinencia animalium*, edd. J. Bouffartigue, M. Patillon, A.-Ph. Segonds, vol. I–III, Paris 2003.
- , *Vita Pythagorae*, in *idem, Opuscula selecta*, ed. A. Nauck, Lipsiae ²1886, pp. 17–52.
- Priscianus, *Periegesis*, in GGM II, Parisiis 1861, pp. 190–199.
- Proclus, *In Platonis Timaeum commentaria*, ed. E. Diehl, vol. I–III, Lipsiae 1903–1906.
- Procopius, *De bellis libri V–VIII (Bellum Gothicum)*, edd. J. Haury, G. Wirth, Lipsiae ²1963.
- Prodicus Cius, in DK II (no. 84), Berlin ⁶1952 (reprint Zürich-Hildesheim 1992), pp. 308–319.
- Prudentius, *Carmina*, ed. M.P. Cunningham, Turnholti 1966 (CCL 126).

- Ptolemaeus, *Handbuch der Geographie*. Griechisch-Deutsch. Hrsg. von A. Stückelberger, G. Graßhoff, Bd. I-II, Basel 2006.
- Ptolemaeus Chennus, *Nova historia*, ed. A. Chatzis, Paderborn 1914 (Studien zur Geschichte und Kultur des Altertums VII 2).
- Pyrgion, in FGrHist III B (no. 467), Leiden 1950 (Leiden ³1993), p. 403.
- Pytheas, *De Oceano*, ed. S. Bianchetti, Pisa-Roma 1998 (Biblioteca di studi antichi 82).
- Res Gestae Divi Augusti*, ed. J. Scheid, Paris 2007.
- , ed. A.E. Cooley, Cambridge 2009.
- Saxo Grammaticus, *Gesta Danorum*, edd. J. Orlik, H. Raeder, Hauniae 1931.
- Scholia Demosthenica*, ed. M.R. Dilts, I-II, Leipzig 1983–1986.
- Scholia in Aeschylum*, ed. O.L. Smith, pars I, Leipzig 1976.
- Scholia in Apollonium vetera*, ed. C. Wendel, Berolini 1935 (Bibliothecae Graecae et Latinae Auctarium Weidmannianum 4).
- Scholia in Aratum vetera*, ed. J. Martin, Stutgardiae 1974.
- Scholia in Aristophanem*, ed. F. Dübner, Parisiis 1883.
- Scholia in Callimachum*, in Callimachus, *Opera*, ed. R. Pfeiffer, vol. II, Oxonii 1953 (reprint Oxonii 1965).
- Scholia in Carmina Gregorii Nazianzeni*, in T. Gaisford, *Catalogus sive notitia manuscriptorum qui a Cel. E.D. Clarke comparati in Bibliotheca Bodleiana adservantur. Pars prior. Inseruntur scholia quaedam inedita in Platonem et in Carmina Gregorii Nazianzeni*, Oxonii 1812, pp. 23–57.
- Scholia in Clementis Alexandrini Protrepticum*, edd. O. Stählin, U. Treu, in Clemens Alexandrinus, *Protrepticus und Paedagogus*, Berlin ³1972 (GCS 12), pp. 295–318.
- Scholia in Euripidem*, ed. E. Schwartz, vol. I-II, Berolini 1887–1891.
- Scholia in Homeri Iliadem (scholia vetera)*, ed. H. Erbse, vol. I-V, Berolini 1969–1977.
- Scholia in Homeri Iliadem*, ed. W. Dindorf, vol. IV, Oxonii 1877.
- Scholia in Lucianum*, ed. H. Rabe, Lipsiae 1906.
- Scholia in Lycophronis Alexandram*, ed. E. Scheer, Berolini 1908.
- Scholia in Theocritum vetera*, ed. C. Wendel, Lipsiae 1914 (reprint Stutgardiae 1967).
- Scholia in Tzetzi Allegorias Iliadis*, in *Anecdota Oxoniensia*, ed. J. A. Cramer, III, Oxonii 1836 (reprint Amsterdam 1963), pp. 376–384.
- Scholia vetera in Pindari carmina*, ed. A.B. Drachmann, vol. I: *Scholia in Olympionicas*, Lipsiae 1903.
- Ps.-Scymnus, *Orbis descriptio*, in GGM I, Parisiis 1855, pp. 196–237.
- Sedulius Scottus, *Carmina*, ed. I. Meyers, Turnholti 1991 (CC Cont. Med. 117).
- , *Collectanea in Epistulam Pauli ad Titum*, ed. J.P. Migne, Lutetiae Parisiorum 1851 (PL 103), coll. 241–250.
- Seneca, *Dialogorum libri duodecim*, ed. L.D. Reynolds, Oxonii 1977.
- Septuaginta*, ed. A. Rahlfs, vol. I–II, Stuttgart 1979.
- Servius, *In Vergilii Aeneidem commentarii*, ed. G. Thilo, vol. I-II, Lipsiae 1881–1884 (In Vergilii Carmina commentarii, I-II).
- , *In Vergilii Bucolica et Georgica commentarii*, ed. G. Thilo, Lipsiae 1887 (In Vergilii Carmina commentarii, III 1).
- Severianus, *In epistulam Pauli ad Titum in Pauluskommentare aus der griechischen Kirche aus Katenenhandschriften gesammelt und herausgegeben von K. Staab*, Münster 1933 (Neutestamentliche Abhandlungen 15), pp. 344–345.
- Sextus Empiricus, *Adversus dogmaticos libri quinque (=Adv. mathem. VII-XI)*, ed. H. Mutschmann, Lipsiae 1914 (reprint Leipzig 1984).
- , Πυρρόνειοι ὑποτυπώσεις, edd. H. Mutschmann, J. Mau, Lipsiae 1958.
- Sidonius Apollinaris, *Carmina*, ed. Ch. Luetjohann, Berolini 1887 (MGH AA 8).
- , ed. W.B. Anderson, Cambridge, Mass.-London 1936 (reprint 1996) [LCL 296].
- Silius Italicus, *Punica*, ed. J. Delz, Stutgardiae 1987.
- Sisyphus, in FGrHist I A (no. 50), Leiden 1957 (reprint Leiden-New York Köln 1995), pp. 284–294.

- Socrates Scholasticus, *Historia Ecclesiastica*, ed. G.Ch. Hansen, Berlin 1995 (GCS).
- Solinus, *Colectanea rerum memorabilium*, ed. Th. Mommsen, Berolini ²1895 (Dublin-Zürich ⁴1979).
- Stephanus Byzantius, *Ethnicorum quae supersunt*, ed. A. Meineke, Berolini 1849 (reprint Graz 1958).
- , *Ethnica*, ed. M. Billerbeck, vol. I-II (A–I), Berolini-Novii Eboraci 2006–2010 (CFHB XLIII 1–2).
- Stesichorus in *Poetarum Melicorum Graecorum Fragmenta*, ed. M. Davies, Oxonii 1991, pp. 133–234.
- Stesimbrotus, in FGrHist II B (no. 107), Berlin 1929 (reprint Leiden 1986), pp. 515–522.
- Stobaeus, *Anthologium*, edd. O. Hense, C. Wachsmuth, vol. I-V, Berolini 1884–1912.
- Strabo, *Geographica*, ed. St. Radt, vol. I-IV, Göttingen 2002–2005.
- Suda, *Lexicon*, ed. A. Adler, vol. I-IV, Lipsiae 1928–1935 (Lexicographi Graeci, vol. 1).
- Suetonius, *De vita Caesarum*, ed. M. Ihm, Lipsiae 1923 (reprint Stuttgartiae-Lipsiae 1993).
- Symeon Metaphrastes, *Martyrium S. Ignatii*, in *Patres Apostolici*, edd. F.X. Funk, F. Diekamp, II, Tübingen ³1913, pp. 383–396.
- Syncellus, *Ecloga chronographica*, ed. A.A. Mosshammer, Leipzig 1984.
- Tacitus, *Annales*, libri XI-XVI, ed. K. Wellesley, Leipzig 1986.
- Tatianus, *Oratio ad Graecos*, ed. M. Marcovich, Berlin-New York 1990 (PTS 32).
- Terentius, *Comoediae*, edd. R. Kauer, W.M. Lindsay, Oxonii 1926.
- Tertullianus, *Ad nationes*, ed. J.W.Ph. Borleffs, Turnholti 1954 (CCL 1), pp. 9–75.
- , *Apologeticum*, ed. E. Dekkers, Turnholti 1954 (CCL 1), pp. 77–171.
- , *De corona*, ed. Aem. Kroymann, Turnholti 1954 (CCL 2), pp. 1037–1065.
- , *De execrandis gentium diis*, in *idem, Opera omnia*, ed. F. Oehler, Lipsiae 1854, pp. 1175–1177.
- , *De idololatria*, edd. A. Reifferscheid, G. Wissowa, Turnholti 1954 (CCL 2), pp. 1099–1124.
- , *De pallio*, ed. A. Gerlo, Turnholti 1954 (CCL 2), pp. 731–750.
- , *De spectaculis*, ed. E. Dekkers, Turnholti 1954 (CCL 1), pp. 225–253.
- Thallus, in FGrHist II B (no. 256), Berlin 1929 (reprint Leiden 1986), pp. 1156–1158.
- Theocritus, *Carmina*, in *Bucolici Graeci*, ed. A.S.F. Gow, Oxonii 1966 (¹1952), pp. 1–129.
- Theodoretus, *Graecarum affectionum curatio*, ed. I. Raeder, Lipsiae 1904.
- , *Interpretatio Epistolae Pauli ad Titum*, edd. J.L. Schulze, J.-P. Migne, Lutetiae Parisiorum 1864 (PG 82), coll. 857–870.
- Theodorus Cyrenaeus, in Diagoras Melius et Theodorus Cyrenaeus, *Reliquiae*, ed. M. Winiarczyk, Leipzig 1981, pp. 31–47.
- Theodorus Mopsuestenus, *In epistulam Pauli ad Titum commentarius*, in Theodore of Mopsuestia, *The Commentaries on the Minor Epistles of Paul*. Translated with an Introduction by R.A. Greer, Leiden-Boston 2011 (Society of Biblical Literature. Writings from the Greco-Roman World 26), pp. 738–771.
- Theodotus, in FGrHist III C (no. 732), Leiden 1958 (reprint Leiden 1969), pp. 692–694.
- , in *Fragmenta Pseudoepigraphorum quae supersunt Graeca una cum historicorum et auctorum Iudaeorum Hellenistarum fragmentis* collegit et ordinavit A.-M. Denis, Leiden 1970, pp. 204–207.
- Theognidea*, in *Iambi et elegi Graeci ante Alexandrum cantati*, ed. M.L. West, vol. I, Oxonii ²1989 (reprint Oxonii 1998), pp. 172–241.
- Theognis, *Elegiae*, ed. D. Young, Leipzig ²1971.
- Theon Smyrnaeus, *Expositio rerum mathematicarum*, ed. E. Hiller, Lipsiae 1878.
- Theophilus Antiochenus, *Ad Autolicum*, ed. M. Marcovich, Berlin-New York 1995 (PTS 44).
- Theophrastus, *De lapidibus*, ed. D.E. Eichholz, Oxford 1965.
- , *Historia plantarum*, ed. F. Wimmer, Lipsiae 1854.

- , ΠΕΡΙ ΕΥΣΕΒΕΙΑΣ, ed. W. Pötscher, Leiden 1964 (*Philosophia Antiqua* 11).
- , *The Sources*, edd. W.W. Fortenbaugh *et al.*, vol. I-II, Leiden 1992 (*Philosophia Antiqua* LIV 1–2).
- Theopompus, in FGrHist II B (no. 115), Berlin 1929 (reprint Leiden 1986), pp. 526–617.
- Theosophia Tubingensis*, in *Theosophorum Graecorum Fragmenta*, ed. H. Erbse, Stuttgartiae-Lipsiae 1995, pp. 1–56.
- Thucydides, *Historiae*, edd. H.S. Jones, J.E. Powell, vol. I-II, Oxonii 1942.
- Tibullus, *Carmina*, ed. G. Luck, Stuttgartiae-Lipsiae ²1998.
- Timaeus, in FGrHist III B (no. 566), Leiden 1950 (³1993), pp. 581–658.
- Tzetzes Joannes, *Historiarum variarum chiliades*, ed. T. Kiessling, Lipsiae 1826.
- Valerius Flaccus, *Argonautica*, ed. E. Courtney, Leipzig 1970.
- Valerius Maximus, *Facta et dicta memorabilia*, ed. J. Briscoe, vol. I-II, Stuttgartiae-Lipsiae 1998.
- Varro, *Antiquitates rerum divinarum*, ed. B. Cardauns, Wiesbaden 1976 (Abhandlungen der Akademie der Wissenschaften und der Literatur zu Mainz. Geistes- und Sozialwissenschaftliche Klasse, Einzelveröffentlichung).
- , *De lingua Latina*, edd. G. Goetz, F. Schoell, Lipsiae 1910.
- , *Rerum rusticarum libri tres*, ed. G. Goetz, Lipsiae ²1929.
- Vergilius, *Opera*, ed. R.A.B. Mynors, Oxonii 1969.
- Ps.-Vergilius, *Culex*, in *Appendix Vergiliana*, ed. W.V. Clausen, Oxonii 1966, pp. 15–36.
- Xenophanes, in DK I (no. 21), Berlin ⁶1951 (reprint Zürich-Hildesheim 1992), pp. 113–139.
- Xenophon, *Anabasis (Expeditio Cyri)*, edd. C. Hude, J. Peters, Leipzig ²1972.
- , *Hellenica (Historia Graeca)*, ed. C. Hude, Lipsiae 1930.
- , *Symposium*, ed. E.C. Marchant, Oxonii ²1921 (Opera omnia, vol. II) [reprint 1958].
- Zeno Citieus, in SVF I, Lipsiae 1905, pp. 1–72.

2. Secondary works

- Aalders, G.J.D., *Die Mischverfassung und ihre historische Dokumentation in den Politica des Aristoteles*, in *La „Politique“ d'Aristote*, Genève 1965 (Entretiens sur l'antiquité classique 11), pp. 199–237.
- , *Die Theorie der gemischten Verfassung im Altertum*, Amsterdam 1968.
- , *Political Thought in Hellenistic Times*, Amsterdam 1975.
- Abel, K., *Zephyritis*, RE X A 1, 1972, coll. 230–234.
- Acosta-Hughes, B., S.A. Stephens, *Callimachus in Context. From Plato to the Augustan Poets*, Cambridge 2012.
- Adler, A., *Kasios*, RE X 2, 1919, coll. 2265–2267.
- Agahd, R., *M. Terenti Varronis antiquitatum rerum divinarum libri I, XIV, XV, XVI*, „Jahrbücher für classische Philologie“, Suppl. 24, 1898, pp. 1–220.
- Akinian, P.N., *Moses Chorenaci*, RE Suppl. VI, 1935, coll. 534–541.
- Albrecht, J., *Saturnus, seine Gestalt in Sage und Kult*, Diss. Halle 1943 (typescript).
- Albrecht, M. von, *A History of Roman Literature from Livius Andronicus to Boethius. With Special Regard to its Influence on World Literature*, I-II, Leiden-New York-Köln 1997 (Mnemosyne suppl. 165, 1–2).
- Albright, W.F., *Yahveh and the Gods of Canaan*, Garden City 1969.
- Aleshire, S.B., *The Athenian Asklepieion. The People, Their Dedications and Their Inventories*, Amsterdam 1989.
- Alföldi, A., *Die Geschichte des Throntabernakels*, „La Nouvelle Clío“ 1/2, 1949/1950, pp. 537–566.
- Alfonsi, L., *Sull' Itifallo di Ermippo (?)*, RhM 106, 1963, pp. 161–164.

- Algra, K. et al. (eds), *The Cambridge History of Hellenistic Philosophy*, Cambridge 1999.
- Algra, K., *Stoic Theology*, in B. Inwood (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to the Stoics*, Cambridge 2003, pp. 153–178.
- Allam, S., *Bevölkerungsklassen*, Lex. Ägypt. I, 1975, p. 774.
- Alonge, M., *Greek Hymns from Performance to Stone*, in *Sacred Words: Orality, Literacy and Religion*, ed. by A.P.M.H. Lardinois, J.H. Blok, M.G.M. van der Poel, Leiden-Boston 2011 (Mnemosyne suppl. 332 = *Orality and Literacy in the Ancient World*, 8), pp. 217–234.
- Alonso-Núñez, J.M., *The Mixed Constitution in Polybius*, “Eranos” 97, 1999, pp. 11–19.
- Alphandéry, L’Évhémérisme et les débuts de l’histoire des religions au moyen âge, RHR 109, 1934, pp. 5–27.
- Altheim, F., *Römische Religionsgeschichte*, II, Baden-Baden 1953.
- Ameling, W., ‘...Et dona ferentes’. *Königliche Stiftungen an griechische Städte und Heiligtümer im Zeitalter des Hellenismus*, “Quaderni Catanesi di Studi Classici e Medievali” 9, 1987, pp. 11–40.
- , *Arsinoe II*, DNP II, 1997, col. 38.
- Amiotti, G., *Le Isole Fortunate: mito, utopia, realtà geografica*, in M. Sordi (ed.), *Geografia e storiografia nel mondo classico*, Milano 1988 (CISA 14), pp. 166–177.
- Anderson, A.R., *Heracles and His Successors. A Study of a Heroic Ideal and the Recurrence of a Heroic Type*, HSCPh 39, 1928, pp. 7–58, esp. pp. 31–37 (“Scipio Africanus”).
- Anderson, G., *Studies in Lucian’s Comic Fiction*, Leiden 1976 (Mnemosyne suppl. 43).
- , *Sage, Saint and Sophist. Holy Men and Their Associates in the Early Roman Empire*, London-New York 1994.
- Andresen, C., *Logos und Nomos. Die Polemik des Kelsos wider das Christentum*, Berlin 1955.
- Andrieu, J., *Procédés de citation et de raccord*, REL 26, 1948, pp. 268–293.
- Annas, J., *An Introduction to Plato’s Republic*, Oxford 1981.
- Antonaccio, C.M., *An Archaeology of Ancestors. Tomb Cult and Hero Cult in Early Greece*, Lanham-London 1995.
- Aouad, M., L. Brisson, *Diagoras de Mélos*, DPhA II, 1994, pp. 750–757.
- Apel, H., *Die Tyrannis von Heraklea*, Diss. Halle 1910.
- Arnott, W.G., *Alexis: The Fragments. A Commentary*, Cambridge 1996 (Cambridge Classical Texts and Commentaries 31).
- Arora, U.P., *The Fragments of Onesikritos on India – An Appraisal*, „Indian Historical Review” 32, 2005, pp. 35–102.
- Arrigoni, G., *Perseo contro Dioniso a Lerna*, in F. Conca (ed.), *Ricordando Raffaele Cantarella. Miscellanea di studi*, Milano 1999 (Università degli Studi di Milano. Facoltà di Lettere e Filosofia. Quaderni di Acme 36), pp. 9–70.
- , *La maschera e lo specchio: il caso di Perseo e Dioniso a Delfi e l’enigma dei Satiri*, QUCC 102 (NS 73), 2003, pp. 9–55, esp. pp. 21–46 („Delfi”).
- Asheri, D., A. Lloyd, A. Corcella, *A Commentary on Herodotus, Books I-IV*. Edited by O. Murray, A. Moreno, Oxford 2007.
- Astin, A.E., *Cato the Censor*, Oxford 1978.
- Aston, E., *Asclepius and the Legacy of Thessaly*, CQ 54, 2004, pp. 18–32.
- Atkinson, K.M.T., *Demosthenes, Alexander and Asebeia*, “Athenaeum” 61, 1973, pp. 310–335.
- Attridge, H.W., R.A. Oden, *Philo of Byblos, The Phoenician History. Introduction, Critical Text, Translation, Notes*, Washington 1981 (The Catholic Biblical Quarterly, Monograph Series 9).
- Auffarth, Ch., *Aufnahme und Zurückweisung ‘Neuer Götter’ im spätklassischen Athen: Religion gegen die Krise, Religion in der Krise?*, in W. Eder (Hg.), *Die athenische Demokratie im 4. Jahrhundert v. Chr. Vollendung oder Verfall einer Verfassungsform?* Akten eines Symposiums 3.–7. August 1992 Bellagio, Stuttgart 1995, pp. 337–365.
- Avanzini, A. (ed.), *Profumi d’Arabia. Atti del Convegno*, Roma 1997 (Saggi di Storia Antica 11).

- Aymard, J., *Scipio l'Africain et les chiens du Capitole*, REL 31, 1953, pp. 111–116.
- , *Polybe, Scipio l'Africain et titre de 'roi'*, Revue du Nord 36 N° 142, 1954, pp. 121–128, reprint in *idem, Études d'histoire ancienne*, Paris 1967, pp. 387–395.
- Babut, D., *Plutarque et le stoïcisme*, Paris 1969 (Publications de l'Université de Lyon).
- Badian, E., *Alexander the Great and the Unity of Mankind*, "Historia" 7, 1958, pp. 425–444, reprint in G.T. Griffith (ed.), *Alexander the Great. The Main Problems*, Cambridge-New York 1966, pp. 287–306 and in E. Badian, *Collected Papers*, pp. 1–19.
- , *Ennius and His Friends*, in Ennius, "Entretiens sur l'Antiquité Classique" 17, 1972, pp. 149–208.
- , *Nearchus the Cretan*, YCS 24, 1975, pp. 147–170, reprint in *idem, Collected Papers*, pp. 193–210.
- , *The Deification of Alexander the Great*, in H.J. Dell (ed.), *Ancient Macedonian Studies in Honor of Ch. F. Edson*, Thessaloniki 1981 (Institute for Balkan Studies 158), pp. 27–71, reprint in *idem, Collected Papers*, pp. 244–281.
- , *Alexander the Great between Two Thrones and Heaven: Variations on an Old Theme*, in A. Small (ed.), *Subject and Ruler: The Cult of the Ruling Power in Classical Antiquity*. Papers Presented at the Conference Held in the University of Alberta on April 13–15, 1994, to Celebrate the 65th Anniversary of D. Fishwick, Ann Arbor 1996 (JRA Suppl. 17), pp. 11–26, reprint in *idem, Collected Papers*, pp. 365–385.
- , *Collected Papers on Alexander*, London-New York 2012.
- Baetke, W., *Die Götterlehre der Snorra-Edda*, Leipzig 1950 (Sitzungsberichte der Sächsischen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Leipzig, Philos.-hist. Kl. 97, 3).
- Baldry, H.C., *The Unity of Mankind in Greek Thought*, Cambridge 1965.
- Balsdon, J.P.V.D., *The „Divinity” of Alexander*, "Historia" 1, 1950, pp. 363–388, reprint in G.T. Griffith, (ed.), *Alexander the Great. The Main Problems*, Cambridge 1966, pp. 179–204.
- Baltrusch, E.A., *Bewunderung, Duldung, Ablehnung: Das Urteil über die Juden in der griechisch-römischen Literatur*, „Klio“ 80, 1998, pp. 403–421.
- Bar-Kochva, B., *The Image of the Jews in Greek Literature. The Hellenistic Period*, Berkeley-Los Angeles-London 2010 (Hellenistic Culture and Society 52).
- Barr, J., *Philo of Byblos and His „Phoenician History”*, BJRL 57, 1974, pp. 17–68.
- Barron, J., *The Tyranny of Doris of Samos*, CR 12, 1962, pp. 189–192.
- Baslez, M.-F., *Écriture monumentale et traditions autobiographiques: l'apport des inscriptions grecques*, in *L'Invention de l'autobiographie d'Hésiode à Saint Augustin. Actes du deuxième colloque de l'Équipe de recherche sur l'hellénisme post-classique* (Paris, École normale supérieure, 14–16 juin 1990), édité par M.-F. Baslez, Ph. Hoffmann, L. Pernot, Paris 1993 (Études de littérature ancienne 5), pp. 71–80.
- Baudissin, W., *Sanchuniathon*, Realencyclopädie für protestantische Theologie und Kirche, hrsg. von A. Hauck, XVII, 1906, pp. 452–470.
- Bauer, H.E., *Essener*, RE Suppl. IV, 1924, coll. 386–430, esp. 411–414 (communal property).
- Baumgarten, A.I., *The Phoenician History of Philo of Byblos. A Commentary*, Leiden 1981 (EPRO 89).
- , *Euhemerus' Eternal Gods: or, How not to be Embarrassed by Greek Mythology*, in Katzoff, R. et al. (ed.), *Classical Studies in Honor of D. Sohlberg*, Ramat Gan 1996, pp. 91–103.
- Baumgarten, R., *Heiliges Wort und Heilige Schrift bei den Griechen. Hieroi Logoi und verwandte Erscheinungen*, Tübingen 1998 (ScriptOralia 110).
- Baunack, J., *Hesychstudien*, in *Xenia Nicolaitana. Festschrift zur Feier des vierhundert-jährigen Bestehens der Nikolaischule zu Leipzig*, hrsg. von O. Dähnhardt, Leipzig 1912, pp. 59–108.
- Beard, M., J. North, S. Price, *Religions of Rome*, II, Cambridge 1998.
- Becker, C., *Donare pateras*, „Hermes“ 87, 1959, pp. 212–222.
- Beek, G.W. van, *Frankincense and Myrrh in Ancient South Arabia*, "Journal of the American Oriental Society" 78, 1958, pp. 141–151.

- Beloch, J., *Socialismus und Kommunismus im Altertum*, "Zeitschrift für Socialwissenschaft" 4, 1901, pp. 359–364.
- Beloch, K.J., *Griechische Geschichte*, IV 2, Berlin-Leipzig ²1927 (reprint Berlin 1967).
- Benedun, Ch., *Asklepios. Der homerische Arzt und der Gott von Epidauros*, RhM 133, 1990, pp. 210–226.
- , *Der frühe Asklepios*, „Orbis terrarum“ 2, 1996, pp. 9–40.
- Bengtson, H., *Scipio Africanus. Seine Persönlichkeit und seine weltgeschichtliche Bedeutung*, HZ 168, 1943, pp. 487–508.
- , *Griechische Geschichte von den Anfängen bis in die römische Kaiserzeit*, München ⁵1996 (HdA III 4).
- Bennett, Ch., *Arsinoe and Berenice at the Olympics*, ZPE 154, 2005, pp. 91–96.
- Berchem, D. van, *Sanctuaires d'Hercule-Melqart. Contribution à l'étude de l'expansion phénicienne en Méditerranée*, „Syria“ 44, 1967, pp. 73–109, 307–336.
- Berdozzo, F., *Götter, Mythen, Philosophen. Lukian und die paganen Göttervorstellungen seiner Zeit*, Berlin-Boston 2011 (UaLG 106).
- Berger, H., *Die geographischen Fragmente des Eratosthenes neu gesammelt, geordnet und besprochen*, Leipzig 1880 (reprint Amsterdam 1964).
- Bergman, J., *Ich bin Isis. Studien zum memphitischen Hintergrund der griechischen Isis-aretalogien*, Uppsala 1968 (Acta Universitatis Upsaliensis, Historia Religionum 3).
- Bergmann, M., *The Philosophers and Poets in the Sarapieion at Memphis*, in P. Schultz, R. von den Hoff (eds), *Early Hellenistic Portraiture. Image, Style, Context*, Cambridge 2007, pp. 246–263.
- , *Sarapis im 3. Jahrhundert v. Chr.*, in G. Weber (Hrsg.), *Alexandria und das ptolomäische Ägypten. Kulturbegegnungen in hellenistischer Zeit*, Berlin 2010, pp. 109–135.
- Bernard, W., *Zwei verschiedene Methoden der Allegorese in der Antike*, in H.-J. Horn, H. Walter (Hgg.), *Die Allegorese des antiken Mythos*, Wiesbaden 1997 (Wolfenbütteler Forschungen 75), pp. 63–83.
- Bertelli, L., *Il modello della società rurale nell'utopia greca*, "Il pensiero politico" 9, 1976, pp. 183–208, reprint in L. Firpo (ed.), *Studi sull'utopia*, Firenze 1977, pp. 5–30.
- , *L'utopia greca*, in L. Firpo (ed.), *Storia delle idee politiche, economiche e sociali*, vol. I: *L'antichità classica*, Torino 1982, pp. 463–581.
- Berve, H., *Das Alexanderreich auf prosopographischer Grundlage*, I–II, München 1926 (reprint Hildesheim 1999).
- , *Dion*, Wiesbaden 1957 (Akademie der Wissenschaften und der Literatur zu Mainz. Abhandlungen der Geistes- und Sozialwissenschaftlichen Klasse 1956, Nr. 10).
- , *Die Tyrannis bei den Griechen*, I–II, München 1967.
- Beschi, L., *Il monumento di Telemachos, fondatore dell'Asklepieion ateniese*, „Annuario della Scuola Archeologica di Atene e delle Missioni Italiane in Oriente“ 45/46 (NS 29/30), 1967/1968, pp. 381–436.
- , *Il rilievo di Telemachos ricompletato*, "Athens Annals of Archaeology" 15, 1982, pp. 31–43.
- Bess, R., *Zenons Politeia*, Leiden-Boston 2011 (Studies on the Interaction of Art, Thought and Power 4).
- Bethe, E., *Quaestiones Diodorae mythographae*, Diss. Göttingen 1887.
- , *Deinarchos von Delos*, RE IV 2, 1901, coll. 2388–2389.
- , *Die griechische Dichtung*, Wildpark-Potsdam 1924–1928 (Handbuch der Literaturwissenschaft 7).
- Bettinetti, S., *La statua di culto nella pratica rituale greca*. Presentazione di W. Burkert, Bari 2001 ("Le Rane". Collana di Studi e Testi. Studi 30).
- Betz, H.D., *Gottmensch*, RAC XII, 1983, coll. 234–312.
- Bichler, R., *Zur historischen Beurteilung der griechischen Staatsutopien*, GB 11, 1984, pp. 179–206, reprint in *idem*, *Historiographie-Ethnographie-Utopie*, II, pp. 31–49.

- , *Athen besiegt Atlantis. Eine Studie über den Ursprung der Staatsutopie*, „Conceptus“ 20, 1986, pp. 71–88, reprint in *idem*, *Historiographie-Ethnographie-Utopie*, II, pp. 51–68.
- , *Von der Insel der Seligen zu Platons Staat. Geschichte der antiken Utopie*, Teil 1, Wien-Köln-Weimar 1995 (Alltag und Kultur im Altertum 3).
- , *Barbarische Inschriften. Eine Herodot-Studie* [2000], reprint in *idem*, *Historiographie-Ethnographie-Utopie*, I, pp. 91–106.
- , *An den Grenzen zur Phantastik. Antike Fahrtenberichte und ihre Beglaubigungsstrategien*, in N. Hömke, M. Baumbach (Hgg.), *Fremde Wirklichkeiten. Literarische Phantastik und die antike Literatur*, Heidelberg 2006, pp. 237–259, reprint in *idem*, *Historiographie-Ethnographie-Utopie*, II, pp. 173–192.
- , *Die Position von Atlantis in der Geschichte der Utopie* [2006], reprint in *idem*, *Historiographie-Ethnographie-Utopie*, II, pp. 89–103.
- , *Historiographie-Ethnographie-Utopie. Gesammelte Schriften*, Teil 1: *Studien zu Herodots Kunst der Historie*; Teil 2: *Studien zur Utopie und der Imagination fremder Welten*, hrsg. von R. Rollinger, Wiesbaden 2007–2008 (Philippika. Marburger Altertumskundliche Abhandlungen XVIII 1–2).
- Bickel, E., *Lehrbuch der Geschichte der römischen Literatur*, Heidelberg ²1961.
- Bickerman, E.J., *Sur un passage d'Hypéride (Epitaphios, col. VIII)*, „Athenaeum“ 51, 1963, pp. 70–85.
- Bidez, J., *La cité du monde et la cité du soleil chez les Stoïciens*, Paris 1932 (=Bulletin de l'Académie Royale de Belgique, Classe des Lettres, etc. V^e sér. t. XVIII n^{os} 7–9, pp. 244–294).
- Bidez, J., F. Cumont, *Les mages hellénisés. Zoroastre, Ostanès et Hystaspe d'après la tradition grecque*, I–II, Paris 1938 (reprint 1973).
- Bidgwood, J.M., *Diodorus and Ctesias*, „Phoenix“ 34, 1980, pp. 302–316.
- Bieler, L., *ΘΕΙΟΣ ΑΝΗΡ. Das Bild des „Göttlichen Menschen“ in Spätantike und Frühchristentum*, I–II, Wien 1935–1936 (reprint Darmstadt 1976).
- Bignone, E., *Storia della letteratura latina*, I, Firenze ²1946.
- Bile M., *Le dialecte crétois ancien. Étude de la langue des inscriptions. Recueil des inscriptions postérieurs aux IC*, Paris 1988 (École Française d'Athènes. Études crétoises 27).
- Billows, R.A., *Antigonos the One-Eyed and the Creation of the Hellenistic State*, Berkeley-Los Angeles-London 1990 (Hellenistic Culture and Society 4).
- Birt, Th., *Die Fünffzahl und die Properzchronologie*, RhM 70, 1915, pp. 253–259.
- Bittner, A., *Gesellschaft und Wirtschaft in Herakleia Pontike. Eine Polis zwischen Tyranis und Selbstverwaltung*, Bonn 1998 (Asia Minor Studien 30).
- Bleckmann, B., *Diodor, Ephoros und die Hellenika Oxyrhynchia*, in M. Horster, Ch. Reitz (eds), *Condensing Texts – Condensed Texts*, Stuttgart 2010 (Palingenesia 98), pp. 435–450.
- Bloch, R.S., *Antike Vorstellungen vom Judentum. Der Judenexkurs des Tacitus im Rahmen der griechisch-römischen Ethnographie*, Stuttgart 2002 (Historia Einzelschriften 160), esp. pp. 27–63 („Die Vorgängerexkurse und ihr 'ethnographischer Sitz'“).
- Blochet, E., *De l'autonomie de l'évolution de la philosophie grecque*, „Le Muséon“ 47, 1934, pp. 123–166, 297–345.
- Block, R. de, *Évhémère, son livre et sa doctrine*, Diss. Liège, Mons 1876.
- Bloedow, E.F., *Evidence for an Early Date for the Cult of Cretan Zeus*, „Kernos“ 4, 1991, pp. 139–177.
- Blumenthal, A. von, *Palaiphatos 4*, RE XVIII 2, 1942, coll. 2451–2455.
- Boardman, J., *Herakles, Peisistratos and Sons*, RA 1972, pp. 52–72.
- , *Herakles, Peisistratos and Eleusis*, JHS 95, 1975, pp. 1–12.
- Bobeth, W., *De indicibus deorum*, Diss. Leipzig 1904.

- Boehringer, D., *Zur Heroisierung historischer Persönlichkeiten bei den Griechen, in Retrospektive. Konzepte von Vergangenheit in der griechisch-römischen Antike*, hrsg. von M. Flashar, H.-J. Gehrke, E. Heinrich, München 1996, pp. 37–61.
- , *Heroenkulte in Griechenland von der geometrischen bis zur klassischen Zeit. Attika, Argolis, Messenien*, Berlin 2001 ((Klio Beih. NF 3).
- Bölte, F., *Triphylia*, RE VII A 1, 1939, coll. 186–201.
- Bolisani, E., *Ennio minore*, Padova 1935.
- Bolkestein, H., *Wohltätigkeit und Armenpflege im vorchristlichen Altertum*, Utrecht 1939 (reprint New York 1979).
- Boll, F., *Firmicus Maternus*, RE VI 2, 1909, coll. 2365–2379.
- Bolle, K.W., *In Defense of Euhemerus*, in J. Puhvel (ed.), *Myth and Law among the Indo-Europeans. Studies in Indo-European Comparative Mythology*, Berkeley-Los Angeles-London 1970 (Publications of the UCLA Center for the Study of Comparative Folklore and Mythology 1), pp. 19–38.
- Bommelaer, J.-F., *Lysandre de Sparte. Histoire et traditions*, Athènes-Paris 1981 (Bibliothèque des Écoles Françaises d'Athènes et de Rome 240).
- Bonnet, C., *Melqart. Cultes et mythes de l'Héraclès tyrien en Méditerranée*, Leuven-Namur 1988 (Bibliothèque de la Faculté de Philosophie et Lettres de Namur 69. Studia Phoenicia 8).
- Bonnet, H., *Reallexikon der ägyptischen Religionsgeschichte*, 3., unveränderte Auflage, Berlin-New York 2000 (1952).
- Borbein, A.H., *Die griechische Statue des 4. Jahrhunderts*, JDAI 88, 1973, pp. 43–212.
- Borca, F., *Terra mari cincta. Insularità e cultura romana*, Roma 2000 (Ricerche. Lettere classiche 69), esp. pp. 53–69 („Le Isole Fortunate, tra etnografia e mito“).
- Bosworth, A.B., *Conquest and Empire. The Reign of Alexander the Great*, Cambridge 1988.
- , *Alexander the Great Part 2: Greece and the Conquered Territories*, CAH VI², 1994, pp. 846–875.
- , *Alexander and the East. The Tragedy of Triumph*, Oxford 1996.
- , *Alexander, Euripides, and Dionysos. The Motivation for Apotheosis*, in R.W. Wallace, E.M. Harris (eds), *Transitions to Empire. Essays in Graeco-Roman History 360–146 B.C. in Honor of E. Badian*, Norman-London 1996, pp. 140–166.
- , *The Historical Setting of Megasthenes' Indica*, CPH 91, 1996, pp. 113–127.
- , *Augustus, the Res Gestae and Hellenistic Theories of Apotheosis*, JRS 89, 1999, pp. 1–18.
- , *Heroic Honours in Syracuse*, in W. Heckel, L.A. Tritle (eds), *Crossroads of History. The Age of Alexander*, Claremont, Calif. 2003, pp. 11–28.
- Bounoure, G., *Eusèbe citateur de Diodore*, REG 95, 1982, pp. 433–439.
- Bousset, W., *Die Beziehungen der ältesten jüdischen Sibylle zur chaldäischen Sibylle und einige weitere Beobachtungen über den synkretischen Charakter der spätjüdischen Literatur*, ZNW 3, 1902, pp. 23–49.
- , *Sibyllen und Sibyllinische Bücher*, in Realencyclopädie für protestantische Theologie und Kirche, hrsg. von A. Hauck, XVIII, 1906, pp. 265–280.
- , *Die Religion des Judentums im späthellenistischen Zeitalter*, hrsg. von H. Gressmann, Tübingen ³1926 (⁴1966).
- Boyancé, P., *Sur la théologie de Varron*, REA 57, 1955, pp. 57–84, reprint in *idem, Études sur la religion romaine*, Paris 1972, pp. 253–282.
- Boys-Stones, G.R., *The Stoics' Two Types of Allegory*, in *idem* (ed.), *Metaphor, Allegory, and the Classical Tradition*, Oxford 2003, pp. 189–216.
- Braun, E., *Die Theorie der gemischten Verfassung im Altertum*, WSt 80, 1967, pp. 78–89.
- Braunert, H., *Die heilige Insel des Euhemerus in der Diodor-Überlieferung*, RhM 108, 1965, pp. 255–268, reprint in *idem, Politik, Recht und Gesellschaft in der griechisch-römischen Antike. Gesammelte Aufsätze und Reden*, hrsg. von K. Telschow, M. Zahrt, Stuttgart 1980 (Kieler Historische Studien 26), pp. 153–164.

- , *Staatstheorie und Staatsrecht im Hellenismus*, „Saeculum“ 19, 1968, pp. 47–66, reprint in *idem, Politik, Recht und Gesellschaft (...)*, pp. 165–190.
- Breccia, E., *Alexandrea ad Aegyptum. A Guide to the Ancient and Modern Town, and to its Graeco-Roman Museum*, Bergamo 1922.
- Bremmer, J.N., Ἐς Μνemosyne, „Mnemosyne“ 30, 1977, pp. 369–374.
- , *Aëtius, Arius Didymus and the Transmission of Doxography*, „Mnemosyne“ 51, 1998, pp. 154–160.
- , *Linus*, DNP VII, 1999, coll. 252–253.
- , *The Rise of the Hero Cult and the New Simonides*, ZPE 158, 2006, pp. 15–26.
- , *Atheism in Antiquity*, in M. Martin (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to Atheism*, Cambridge 2007, pp. 11–26.
- , *Anaphe, Apollo Aiglētēs and the Origin of Asclepius*, in *idem, Greek Religion (...)*, pp. 249–265.
- , *Greek Fallen Angels: Kronos and the Titans*, in *idem, Greek Religion (...)*, pp. 73–99.
- , *Greek Religion and Culture, the Bible and the Ancient Near East*, Leiden-Boston 2008 (*Jerusalem Studies in Religion and Culture* 8).
- , *Manteis, Magic, Mysteries and Mythography: Messy Margins of Polis Religion?*, „Kernos“ 23, 2010, pp. 13–35.
- Breton, J.-F., *Arabia Felix from the Time of the Queen Sheba. Eighth Century B.C. to First Century A.D.*, translated from the French by A. LaFarge, Notre Dame, Indiana 1999.
- Bringmann, K., *Der König als Wohltäter. Beobachtungen und Überlegungen zur hellenistischen Monarchie*, in J. Bleicken (Hrsg.), *Colloquium aus Anlass des 80. Geburtstags von A. Heuß*, Kallmünz 1993, pp. 83–95; English version: *The King as Benefactor: Some Remarks on Ideal Kingship in the Age of Hellenism*, in *Images and Ideologies. Self-definition in the Hellenistic World*, ed. by A. Bulloch, E.S. Gruen, A.A. Long, and A. Stewart, Berkeley-Los Angeles-London 1993 (*Hellenistic Culture and Society* 12), pp. 7–24.
- , *Geben und Nehmen. Monarchische Wohltätigkeit und Selbstdarstellung im Zeitalter des Hellenismus*, Berlin 2000 (= *Schenkungen hellenistischer Herrscher an griechische Städte und Heiligtümer*, hrsg. von K. Bringmann, H. von Steuben, Teil II 1).
- Bringmann, K., H. von Steuben, *Schenkungen hellenistischer Herrscher an griechische Städte und Heiligtümer*, Teil I: Zeugnisse und Kommentare, Berlin 1995.
- Brodersen, K., „Das aber ist eine Lüge!“. Zur rationalistischen Mythenkritik des Palaiphatos, in R. von Haehling (Hrsg.), *Griechische Mythologie und frühes Christentum*, Darmstadt 2005, pp. 44–57.
- Brommer, F., *Vasenlisten zur griechischen Heldensage*, Marburg³ 1973.
- Brown, T. S., *Euhemerus and the Historians*, HThR 39, 1946, pp. 259–274.
- , *Onesicritus. A Study in Hellenistic Historiography*, Berkeley-Los Angeles 1949 (*University of California Publications in History* 39) [reprint New York 1974].
- Brunnhöfer, H., *Vom Aral bis zur Gangä. Historisch-geographische und ethnologische Skizzen zur Urgeschichte der Menschheit*, Leipzig 1892 (*Einzelbeiträge zur allgemeinen und vergleichenden Sprachwissenschaft* 12).
- Bruwaene, M. van den, *Traces de mythologie égyptienne dans le De natura deorum de Cicéron (III 53–60)*, „Latomus“ 38, 1979, pp. 368–412.
- Buck, R.J., *Communalism on the Lipari Islands (Diod. 5. 9. 4)*, CPh 54, 1959, pp. 35–39.
- Buffière, F., *Les mythes d'Homère et la pensée grecque*, Paris 1956 (*Collection d'Études Anciennes*).
- Buitenwerf, R., *Book III of the Sibylline Oracles and Its Social Setting. With an Introduction, Translation and Commentary*, Leiden-Boston 2003 (*Studia in Veteris Testamenti Pseudepigrapha* 17).
- Bulloch, A.W., *Callimachus*, in *The Cambridge History of Classical Literature*, I: *Greek Literature*, ed. by P.E. Easterling and B.M.W. Knox, Cambridge 1985, pp. 549–570.
- Buondelmonti, Ch., *Descriptio insule Crete et Liber insularum*, ed. M.-A. Spitael, Heraklion 1981.

- Burasalis, K., *Political Gods and Heroes or the Hierarchization of Political Divinity in the Hellenistic World*, in *Modelli eroici dall'antichità alla cultura europea*, Bergamo, 20–22 novembre 2001, a cura di A. Barzanò, C. Bearzot, F. Landucci, L. Prandi, G. Zecchini, Roma 2003 (Centro ricerche e documentazione sull'antichità classica. Monografie 23), pp. 185–197.
- Buraselis, K., S. Aneziri, *Die griechische und hellenistische Apotheose*, ThesCRA II, 2004, pp. 158–186.
- Burde, P., *Untersuchungen zur antiken Universalgeschichtsschreibung*, Diss. Erlangen/Nürnberg 1972, München 1974.
- Burkert, W., *The Formation of Greek Religion at the Close of the Dark Age*, SIFC 3. ser., 10, 1992, pp. 533–551, reprint in *idem, Kleine Schriften*, I: *Homerica*, hrsg. von Ch. Riedweg, Göttingen 2001 (Hypomnemata suppl. 2), pp. 13–29.
- , *Homo Necans. Interpretationen altgriechischer Opferriten und Mythen*. 2. um ein Nachwort erweiterte Auflage, Berlin-New York 1997. English version: *The Anthropology of Ancient Greek Sacrificial Ritual and Myth*, translated by P. Bing, Berkeley-Los Angeles-London 1983.
- , *Vergöttlichung von Menschen in der griechisch-römischen Antike*, in J. Stagl, W. Reinhard (Hgg.), *Grenzen des Menschseins: Probleme einer Definition des Menschlichen*, Wien-Köln-Weimar 2005, pp. 401–419, reprint in W. Burkert, *Kleine Schriften VI: Mythica, Ritualia, Religiosa* 3. *Kulte und Feste*, hrsg. von E. Krummen, Göttingen 2011 (Hypomnemata suppl. 2), pp. 259–276.
- , *Griechische Religion der archaischen und klassischen Epoche*. Zweite, überarbeitete und erweiterte Auflage, Stuttgart 2011 (Die Religionen der Menschheit 15); English version: *Greek Religion*, translated by J. Raffan, Cambridge, Mass. 1985.
- Burstein, S.M., *Outpost of Hellenism. The Emergence of Heraclea on the Black Sea*, Berkeley-Los Angeles-London 1976.
- Burton, A., *Diodorus Siculus, Book I. A Commentary*, Leiden 1972 (EPRO 29).
- Cadell, H., *À quelle date Arsinoë II Philadelphie est-elle décédée?*, in H. Melaerts (éd.), *Le culte du souverain dans l'Égypte ptolémaïque au III^e siècle avant notre ère*, Leuven 1998 (Studia Hellenistica 34), pp. 1–3.
- Cahen, É., *Les hymnes de Callimaque. Commentaire explicatif et critique*, Paris 1930 (Bibliothèque des Écoles Françaises d'Athènes et de Rome 134 bis) [21940].
- Calvert, B., *Slavery in Plato's Republic*, CQ 37, 1987, pp. 367–372.
- Canfora, L., *Sull'Euhemerus di Ennio*, in *idem, Studi di storia della storiografia romana*, Bari-S. Spirito 1993, pp. 317–321.
- Capdeville, G., *L'oracle de l'Ida crétois*, „Kernos” 3, 1990, pp. 89–101.
- Capelle, P., *Elysium und Inseln der Seligen*, ARW 25, 1927, pp. 245–264 and 26, 1928, pp. 17–40.
- Capelle, W., *Nearchos*, RE XVI 2, 1935, coll. 2135–2154.
- Cappellano, E., *Il fattore politico negli onori divini a Demetrio Poliorcete*, Torino 1954.
- Cappelletto, P., *I frammenti di Mnasea. Introduzione, testo e commento*, Milano 2003 (Il Filarete. Università degli Studi di Milano. Pubblicazioni della Facoltà di Lettere e Filosofia 209).
- Cardauns, B., *M. Terentius Varro, Antiquitates rerum divinarum*, I: *Die Fragmente*, II: *Kommentar*, Wiesbaden 1976 (Abhandlungen der Akademie der Wissenschaften und der Literatur zu Mainz. Geistes- und Sozialwissenschaftliche Klasse, Einzelveröffentlichung).
- , *Varro und die römische Religion. Zur Theologie, Wirkungsgeschichte und Leistung der „Antiquitates Rerum Divinarum“*, ANRW II 16, 1, 1978, pp. 80–103.
- Carena, M., *La critica della mitologia pagana negli apologeti greci del II secolo*, „Didaskaleion” NS 1, 1923, fasc. 2, pp. 23–55; fasc. 3, pp. 3–38.
- Carney, E., *The Philippeum, Women, and the Formation of Dynastic Image*, in *Alexander's Empire. Formulation to Decay*, ed. by W. Heckel, L. Tritle, P. Wheatley, Claremont, Cal. 2007, pp. 27–60.

- Carrière, J., *Philadelphie ou Sôtêr? A propos d'un Hymne de Callimaque*, "Studii Classice" 11, 1969, pp. 85–93.
- Carsana, Ch., *Le dirigenze cittadine nello stato seleucidico*, Como 1996 (Biblioteca di Athenaeum 30).
- Cartledge, P., *Agesilaos and the Crisis of Sparta*, Baltimore 1987.
- Casadio, G., *Storia del culto di Dioniso in Argolide*, Roma 1994.
- Casertano, G., *Che cosa ha 'veramente' detto Epimenide*, in E. Federico, A. Visconti (ed.), *Epimenide cretese*, Napoli 2001 (Quaderni del Dipartimento di Discipline Storiche „E. Lepore” dell' Università "Federico II", Napoli, 2), pp. 357–390.
- Caspari, C.P., *Martin von Bracara's Schrift „De correctione rusticorum“ zum ersten Male vollständig und in verbessertem Text herausgegeben, mit Anmerkungen begleitet und mit einer Abhandlung über dieselbe sowie über Martins Leben und übrige Schriften eingeleitet*, Christiania 1883.
- Caspari, F., *Studien zu dem Kallixenosfragment Athenaios 5, 197 c – 203 b*, „Hermes“ 68, 1933, pp. 400–414.
- Cassola, F., *Diodoro e la storia romana*, ANRW II 30, 1, 1982, pp. 724–773.
- Casson, L., *Travel in the Ancient World*, London 1974.
- Cawkwell, G.L., *The Deification of Alexander the Great: A Note*, in I. Worthington (ed.), *Ventures into Greek History*, Oxford 1994, pp. 293–306.
- Cerfaux, L., J. Tondriau, *Un concurrent de christianisme: Le culte des souverains dans la civilisation gréco-romaine*, Paris 1957 (Bibliothèque de Théologie, sér. III, vol.5).
- Cerri, G., *Elea, Senofane e Leucothea*, in A.C. Cassio, P. Poccetti (ed.), *Forme di religiosità e tradizioni sapienziali in Magna Grecia*. Atti del Convegno Napoli 14–15 dicembre 1993, AION. Sezione filologico-letteraria 16, 1994, pp. 137–155.
- Chamoux, F., *Un historien mal-aimé: Diodore de Sicile*, BAGB 1990, pp. 243–252.
- , *Introduction générale. Diodore: l'homme et l'oeuvre*, in *Diodore de Sicile. Bibliothèque Historique*, I, Paris 1993 (Collection Budé).
- Chaniotis, A., *Sich selbst feiern? Städtische Feste des Hellenismus im Spannungsfeld von Religion und Politik*, in M. Wörle, P. Zanker (Hgg.), *Stadt und Bürgerbild im Hellenismus. Kolloquium, München, 24. bis 26. Juni 1993*, München 1995 (Vestigia 47), pp. 147–172.
- , *The Divinity of Hellenistic Rulers*, in A. Erskine (ed.), *A Companion to the Hellenistic World*, Malden, Mass.-Oxford-Carlton, Victoria 2003 (Blackwell Companions to the Ancient World), pp. 431–445.
- , *La divinité mortelle d'Antiochos III à Téos*, „Kernos” 20, 2007, pp. 153–171.
- Charlesworth, M.P., *Some Observations on Ruler-Cult, especially in Rome*, HThR 28, 1935, pp. 5–44.
- Chassignet, M., *Étiologie, étymologie et éponymie chez Cassius Hemina: mécanismes et fonction*, LEC 66, 1998, pp. 321–335.
- Chuvin, P., Yoyotte, J., *Documents relatifs au culte pélusien de Zeus Casios*, RA 1986 1986, pp. 41–63.
- Cichorius, C., *Römische Studien. Historisches, Epigraphisches, Literaturgeschichtliches aus vier Jahrhunderten*, Leipzig-Berlin 1922.
- Cipolla, P., *Poeti minori del dramma satiresco. Testo critico, traduzione e commento*, Amsterdam 2003 (Supplementi di Lexis 23).
- Cizek, E., *L'esprit militant des stoïciens et le premier État communiste de l'histoire*, „Latomus” 65, 2006, pp. 49–61.
- Classen, C.J., *Romulus in der römischen Republik*, „Philologus” 106, 1962, pp. 174–204.
- , *Gottmenschen in der römischen Republik*, „Gymnasium” 70, 1963, pp. 312–338, reprint in *idem, Die Welt der Römer. Studien zu ihrer Literatur, Geschichte und Religion*, hrsg. von H. Bernsdorff, M. Vielberg, Berlin-New York 1993 (UaLG 41), pp. 12–38.
- Clauss, J.J., *Lies and Allusions: The Addressee and Date of Callimachus' Hymn to Zeus*, ClAnt 5, 1986, pp. 155–170.

- , *From the Head of Zeus: The Beginnings of Roman Literature*, in *idem* – M. Cuypers (eds), *A Companion to Hellenistic Literature*, Malden, Mass.-Oxford-Chichester 2010 (Blackwell Companions to the Ancient World), pp. 463–478.
- Clauss, M., *Kaiser und Gott. Herrscherkult im römischen Reich*, Stuttgart-Leipzig 1999.
- Clay, J.S., *Goat Island: Od. 9.116–141*, CQ 74 (NS 30) 1980, pp. 261–264.
- , *Aeolia, or under the Sign of the Circle*, CJ 80, 1985, pp. 289–291.
- Clayman, D.L., *Callimachus' Iambi*, Leiden 1980 (Mnemosyne suppl. 59).
- Clemen, C., *Die phönikische Religion nach Philo von Byblos*, Leipzig 1939 (Mitteilungen der Vorderasiatisch-Aegyptischen Gesellschaft XLII 3).
- Clinton, K., *The Epidauria and the Arrival of Asclepius in Athens*, in R. Hägg (ed.), *Ancient Greek Cult Practice from the Epigraphical Evidence*. Proceedings of the Second International Seminar on Ancient Greek Cult, Organized by the Swedish Institute at Athens, 22–24 November 1991, Stockholm 1994 (Acta Instituti Regni Sueciae. Series altera in 8°, 13), pp. 17–34.
- Coffey, M., *Roman Satire*, London 1976.
- Cohen, G.M., *The Hellenistic Settlements in Europe, the Islands, and Asia Minor*, Berkeley-Los Angeles-Oxford 1995 (Hellenistic Culture and Society 17).
- Coldstream, J.N., *Hero Cults in the Age of Homer*, JHS 96, 1976, pp. 8–17.
- Cole, S., *Cicero, Ennius, and the Concept of Apotheosis at Rome*, “Arethusa” 39, 2006, pp. 531–548.
- Cole, S.G., *The Uses of Water in Greek Sanctuaries*, in R. Hägg, N. Marinatos, G.C. Nordquist (eds), *Early Greek Cult Practice*. Proceedings of the Fifth International Symposium at the Swedish Institute at Athens, 26–29 June 1986, Stockholm 1988 (Acta Instituti Atheniensis Regni Sueciae. Series in 4°, 38), pp. 161–165.
- Cole, Th., *Democritus and the Sources of Greek Anthropology*, Atlanta 21990 (American Philological Association. Monograph Series 25) [1967].
- Collins, J.J., *The Development of the Sibylline Tradition*, ANRW II, 20, 1, 1987, pp. 421–459.
- , *Seers, Sibyls and Sages in Hellenistic-Roman Judaism*, Leiden-New York-Köln (Supplements to the Journal for the Study of Judaism 54).
- Colpe, C., *Heilige Schriften*, RAC XIV, 1987, coll. 184–223.
- , *Utopie und Atheismus in der Euhemerus-Tradition*, in *Panchaia. Festschrift für K. Thraede*, hrsg. von M. Wacht, Münster 1995 (JbAC Ergbd. 22), pp. 32–44.
- Conte, G.B., *Latin Literature. A History*. Translated by J.B. Solodow. Revised by D. Fowler and G.W. Most, Baltimore-London 1994.
- Cook, A.B., *Zeus. A Study in Ancient Religion*, I–III, Cambridge 1914–1925–1940 (reprint New York 1964).
- Cooke, J.D., *Euhemerism. A Medieval Interpretation of Classical Paganism*, “Speculum” 2, 1927, pp. 396–410.
- Cooley, A.E., *Res Gestae Divi Augusti. Text, Translation, and Commentary*, Cambridge 2009.
- Corcella, A., *Dionisio Skytobrachion, i phoinikeia e l' “alfabeto pelasgico”*. Per una corretta interpretazione di Diodoro III. 67. 1 (FGrHist 32 F 8), Atti della Accademia delle Scienze di Torino. Classe di scienze morali, storiche e filologiche 120, 1987, pp. 41–82.
- Cosmetatou, E., *Bilistiche and the Quasi-Institutional Status of Ptolemaic Royal Mistress*, APF 50, 2004, pp. 18–36.
- Courcelle, P., *Un vers d'Épiménide dans le “Discours sur l'Aréopage”*, REG 76, 1963, pp. 404–413.
- Courtney, E., *The Fragmentary Latin Poets. Edited with Commentary*, Oxford 1993 (reprint 2003).
- , *Archaic Latin Prose*, Atlanta, Georgia 1999 (American Classical Studies 42).
- Criscuolo, L., *Agoni e politica alla corte di Alessandria. Riflessioni su alcuni epigrammi di Posidippo*, “Chiron” 33, 2003, pp. 311–333.

- Crowther, Ch., M. Facella, *New Evidence for the Ruler Cult of Antiochus of Commagene from Zeugma*, in *Neue Forschungen zur Religionsgeschichte Kleinasien* E. Schwertheim zum 60. Geburtstag gewidmet, hrsg. von G. Heedemann, E. Winter, Bonn 2003 (Asia Minor Studien 49), pp. 41–80.
- Crusius, O., *Akantho*, RML I, 1884–1886, col. 207.
- , *Ad scriptores Latinos exegetica*, RhM 47, 1892, esp. pp. 63–64 (De Euhemero poeta).
- Currie, B., *Euthymos of Locri: A Case Study in Heroization in the Classical Period*, JHS 122, 2002, pp. 24–44.
- , *Pindar and the Cult of Heroes*, Oxford 2005 (Oxford Classical Monographs).
- , *Heroes and Holy Men in Early Greece: Hesiod's theios aner*, in A. Coppola (ed.), *Eroi, eroismi, eroizzazione dalla Grecia antica a Padova e Venezia. Atti del Convegno Internazionale Padova 18–19 settembre 2006*, Padova 2007, pp. 163–203.
- Curtius, E.R., *Europäische Literatur und lateinisches Mittelalter*, Bern 1948 (⁴1965).
- D'Alessio, G.B., *Callimaco. Introduzione, traduzione e note*, I, Milano 1996.
- Damaskos, D., *Untersuchungen zu hellenistischen Kultbildern*, Stuttgart 1999.
- Davies, M., *Sisyphus and the Invention of Religion* ("Critias" TrGF I [43] 19 = B 25 DK), BICS 36, 1989, pp. 16–32.
- Dawson, C.M., *The Iambi of Callimachus. A Hellenistic Poet's Experimental Laboratory*, YCS 11, 1950, pp. 1–168.
- Dawson, D., *Cities of the Gods. Communist Utopias in Greek Thought*, New York-Oxford 1992.
- De Angelis, F., B. Garstad, *Euhemerus in Context*, ClAnt 25, 2006, pp. 211–242.
- Decharme, P., *La critique des traditions religieuses chez les Grecs des origines au temps de Plutarque*, Paris 1904 (reprint Bruxelles 1966).
- Deichgräber, K., *Persaios*, RE XIX 1, 1937, coll. 926–931.
- Delatte, Ch., *HMIΘEOΣ en question: l'homme, le héros et le demi-dieu*, REG 120, 2007, pp. 481–510.
- Della Corte, F., *Intorno alle Saturae di Ennio*, Atti della Reale Accademia delle Scienze di Torino. Classe di scienze morali, storiche e filologiche, vol. 71, t. II, 1935/1936, Torino 1936, pp. 185–192.
- De Maigret, A., *The Frankincense Road from Najrān to Ma'ān: A Hypothetical Itinerary*, in A. Avanzini (ed.), *Profumi d'Arabia* (...), Roma 1997, pp. 315–331.
- Demandt, A., *Der Idealstaat. Die politischen Theorien der Antike*, Köln-Weimar-Wien ²1993 (³2000).
- Denis, A.-M., *Fragmenta Pseudoepigraphorum quae supersunt Graeca una cum historico-rum et auctorum Iudaeorum Hellenistarum fragmentis collegit et ordinavit*, Leiden 1970.
- De Sanctis, G., *Gli ultimi messaggi di Alessandro ai Greci: La richiesta degli onori divini*, RFIC 18, 1940, pp. 1–21.
- Dibelius, M., *Paulus auf dem Areopag*, Heidelberg 1939 (SHAW, Philos.-hist. Kl. 1938/1939, 2. Abh.).
- , *Die Reden der Apostelgeschichte und die antike Geschichtsschreibung*, Heidelberg 1949 (SHAW 35, 1).
- Diels, H., *Doxographi Graeci. Collegit, recensuit, prolegomenis indicibusque instruxit*, Berolini 1879 (1965⁴).
- Dierauer, U., *Tier und Mensch im Denken der Antike. Studien zur Tierpsychologie, Anthropologie und Ethik*, Amsterdam 1977 (Studien zur antiken Philosophie 6).
- Dieterle, M., *Dodona. Religionsgeschichtliche und historische Untersuchungen zur Entstehung und Entwicklung des Zeus-Heiligtums*, Hildesheim-Zürich-New York 2007 (Spudasmata 116).
- Dietrich, B.C., *The Origins of Greek Religion*, Berlin-New York 1974.
- Dihle, A., *Verrius Flaccus*, RE VIII A 2, 1958, coll. 1636–1645.
- , *Zur hellenistischen Ethnographie*, in *Grecs et barbares*, Vandoeuvres-Genève 1962 (Entretiens sur l'antiquité classique 8), pp. 217–232, reprint in *idem, Antike und Orient* (...), pp. 21–46.

- , *Das Satyrspiel "Sisyphos"*, "Hermes" 105, 1977, pp. 28–42.
- , *Antike und Orient. Gesammelte Aufsätze*, hrsg. von V. Pöschl und H. Petersmann, Heidelberg 1984 (Supplemente zu den SHAW, Philos.-hist. Kl. 1983, Bd. 2).
- , *Die Griechen und die Fremden*, München 1994.
- , *Die Theologia tripertita bei Augustin*, in H. Cancik (Hrsg.), *Geschichte – Tradition – Reflexion. Festschrift für M. Hengel*, II, Tübingen 1996, pp. 183–202.
- Dillery, J., *Hecataeus of Abdera: Hyperboreans, Egypt and the Interpretatio Graeca*, "Historia" 47, 1998, pp. 255–275.
- , *The First Egyptian Narrative History: Manetho and Greek Historiography*, ZPE 127, 1999, pp. 93–116.
- Dochhorn, J., *Ein 'Inschriftenfund' auf Panchaia. Zur Hiera Anagraphe des Euhemerios von Messene*, in J.U. Kalms (Hrsg.), *Internationales Josephus-Kolloquium Aarhus 1999*, Münster 2000 (Münsteraner Judaistische Studien 6), pp. 265–297.
- , *Vegetationskult in der Urzeit, Euseb, P.E. 1, 10, 6–7 und die Anfänge der Kultur- und Religionsgeschichte bei Philo von Byblos*, RhM 144, 2001, pp. 397–429.
- , *Zur Entstehungsgeschichte der Religion bei Euhemerios: mit einem Ausblick auf Philo von Byblos*, ZRGG 53, 2001, pp. 289–301.
- , *Porphyrus über Sanchuniathon. Quellenkritische Überlegungen zu Praep. Ev. 1, 9, 21*, „Die Welt des Orients“ 32, 2002, pp. 121–145.
- Dörrie, H., *Der Königs-kult des Antiochos von Kommagene im Lichte neuer Inschriften-funde*, Göttingen 1964 (Abhandlungen der Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen, Phil.-hist. Kl. 3 Folge, Nr. 60, 1964).
- , *Euhemerios*, KP II, 1967, coll. 414–415.
- , *Das gute Beispiel – ΚΑΛΟΝ ΥΠΟΔΕΙΓΜΑ. Ein Lehrstück vom politischen Nutzen sakraler Stiftungen in Kommagene und in Rom*, in *Studien zur Religion und Kultur Kleinasien. Festschrift für F.K. Dörner*, hrsg. von S. Şahin, E. Schwertheim, J. Wagner, I. Leiden 1978 (EPRO 66), pp. 245–262.
- , *Gottesvorstellung*, RAC XII, 1983, coll. 81–154.
- , *Zu Varros Konzeption der theologia tripertita in den Antiquitates rerum divinarum*, in *Beiträge zur altitalischen Geistesgeschichte. Festschrift für G. Radke*, hrsg. von R. Altheim-Stiehl, M. Rosenbach, Münster 1986, pp. 76–82.
- Dominguez Garcia, V., *Los dioses de la ruta del incienso. Un estudio sobre Evéméro de Messene*, Oviedo 1994 (non vidi).
- Donohue, A.A., *The Greek Images of the Gods: Considerations on Terminology and Methodology*, „Hephaistos“ 15, 1997, pp. 31–45.
- Doran, R., *The Jewish Hellenistic Historians Before Josephus*, ANRW II 20, 1, 1987, pp. 246–297.
- Dow, S., D.H. Gill, *The Greek Cult Table*, AJA 69, 1965, pp. 103–114.
- Dräger, P., *Untersuchungen zu den Frauenkatalogen Hesiods*, Stuttgart 1997 (Palingsnesia 61).
- Drews, R., *The Greek Accounts of Eastern History*, Washington 1973.
- Dreyer, B., *Untersuchungen zur Geschichte des spätklassischen Athen (322-ca. 230 v. Chr.)*, Stuttgart 1999 (Historia Einzelschriften 137).
- , *Heroes, Cults, and Divinity*, in W. Heckel, L.A. Tritle (eds), *Alexander the Great. A New History*, Malden, Mass.-Oxford-Chichester 2009, pp. 218–234.
- Droge, A.J., *Homer or Moses? Early Christian Interpretations of the History of Culture*, Tübingen 1989 (Hermeneutische Untersuchungen zur Theologie 26).
- Drozdek, A., *Greek Philosophers as Theologians. The Divine Arche*, Aldershot-Burlington 2007.
- Dubielzig, U., *Roman, Novelle und verwandte Gattungen*, in Lex. Hellen. 2005, coll. 934–946.
- Dušanic, S., *Plato's Atlantis*, AC 51, 1982, pp. 25–52.
- Du Toit, D.S., *Theios anthropos. Zur Verwendung von θεῖος ἄνθρωπος und sinnverwandten Ausdrücken in der Literatur der Kaiserzeit*, Tübingen 1997 (WUNT 2. Reihe, 91).

- Ebach, J., *Weltentstehung und Kulturentwicklung bei Philo von Byblos. Ein Beitrag zur Überlieferung der biblischen Urgeschichte im Rahmen des altorientalischen und antiken Schöpfungsglaubens*, Stuttgart-Berlin-Köln-Mainz 1979 (Beiträge zur Wissenschaft vom Alten und Neuen Testament. Sechste Folge, H. 8 (Der ganzen Sammlung H. 108)).
- , *Euhemerismus*, in *Handbuch religionswissenschaftlicher Grundbegriffe*, III, 1990, pp. 365–368.
- Edelmann, B., *Religiöse Herrschaftslegitimation in der Antike. Die religiöse Legitimation orientalisches-ägyptischer und griechisch-hellenistischer Herrschaft im Vergleich*, St. Katharinen 2007 (PHAROS. Studien zur griechisch-römischen Antike 20).
- Edelstein, E. J., L. Edelstein, *Asclepius. A Collection and Interpretation of the Testimonies*, I-II, Baltimore 1945.
- Edelstein, L., I.G. Kidd, Posidonius, I: *The Fragments*, Cambridge 21989 (Cambridge Classical Texts and Commentaries 13).
- Edwards, M.J., *Philo or Sanchuniaton? A Phoenician Cosmogony*, CQ 41, 1991, pp. 213–220.
- Effe, B., *Προτέγη γενεή. Eine stoische Hesiod-Interpretation in Arats Phainomena*, RhM 113, 1970, pp. 167–182.
- Effterre, H. van, *La Crète et le monde grec de Platon à Polybe*, Paris 1948.
- Ehrenberg, V., *Athenischer Hymnus auf Demetrios Poliorketes*, „Die Antike“ 7, 1931, pp. 279–297.
- , *Alexander and the Greeks*, Oxford 1938.
- Eich, P., *Gottesbild und Wahrnehmung. Studien zu Ambivalenzen früher griechischer Götterdarstellungen (ca. 800 v. Chr. – ca. 400 v. Chr.)*, Stuttgart 2011 (Potsdamer Altertumswissenschaftliche Beiträge 34).
- Eichgrün, E., *Kallimachos und Apollonios Rhodios*, Diss. Berlin (West) 1961.
- Eisenberger, H., *Demokrits Vorstellung vom Sein und Wirken der Götter*, RhM 113, 1970, pp. 141–158.
- Eißfeldt, O., *Baal Zaphon, Zeus Kasios und die Durchführung der Israeliten durchs Meer*, Halle 1932 (Beiträge zur Religionsgeschichte des Altertums 1).
- , *Der Gott des Tabor und seine Verbreitung*, ARW 31, 1934, pp. 14–41, reprint in *idem, Kleine Schriften*, hrsg. von R. Sellheim und F. Maass, II, Tübingen 1963, pp. 29–54.
- , *Ras Schamra und Sanchuniaton*, Halle 1939 (Beiträge zur Religionsgeschichte des Altertums 4).
- , *Taautos und Sanchuniaton*, Berlin 1952 (SDAW, Klasse für Sprachen, Literatur und Kunst 1952, 1).
- , *Sanchuniaton*, RGG³ V, 1961, col. 1361.
- Ekroth, G., *The Sacrificial Rituals of Greek Hero-Cults in the Archaic to the Early Hellenistic Periods*, Liège 2002 (Kernos suppl. 12).
- , *Heroes and Hero-Cults*, in D. Ogden (ed.), *A Companion to Greek Religion*, Chichester 2010 (2007) [Blackwell Companions to the Ancient World], pp. 100–114.
- Elliger, W., *Die Darstellung der Landschaft in der griechischen Dichtung*, Berlin-New York 1975 (UaLG 15).
- Ellis, J.R., *Macedonian Hegemony Created*, CAH VI², 1994, pp. 760–790.
- Elter, A., *Donarem pateras...Horat. Carm. 4,8, II*, Bonn 1907.
- Endres, C.F., A. Schimmel, *Das Mysterium der Zahl. Zahlensymbolik im Kulturvergleich*, Köln 1984.
- Erbse, H., *Fragmente griechischer Theosophien*, Hamburg 1941 (Hamburger Arbeiten zur Altertumswissenschaft 4).
- , *Untersuchungen zur Funktion der Götter im homerischen Epos*, Berlin-New York 1986 (UaLG 24).
- Erlor, M., *Epicurus as deus mortalis: Homoiosis theoi and Epicurean Self-cultivation*, in D. Frede, A. Laks (eds), *Traditions of Theology. Studies in Hellenistic Theology, Its Background and Aftermath*, Leiden-Boston-Köln 2002 (Philosophia Antiqua 89), pp. 159–181.

- Erman, A., *Die Literatur der Ägypter. Gedichte, Erzählungen und Lehrbücher aus dem 3. und 2. Jahrtausend v. Chr.*, Leipzig 1923 (reprint Leipzig 1978).
- Erskine, A., *Between Philosophy and the Court: The Life of Persaios of Kition*, in A. Erskine, L. Llewellyn-Jones (eds), *Creating a Hellenistic World*, Swansea 2011, pp. 177–194.
- Étienne, R., *Le culte impérial dans la péninsule ibérique d'Auguste à Diocletien*, Paris 1958, pp. 88–92.
- Eucken, Ch., *Isokrates. Seine Positionen in der Auseinandersetzung mit den zeitgenössischen Philosophen*, Berlin-New York 1983 (UaLG 19).
- Falk, H., *Die sieben "Kasten" des Megasthenes*, "Acta Orientalia" 43, 1982, pp. 61–68.
- Farnell, L.R., *Greek Hero Cults and Ideas of Immortality. The Gifford Lectures Delivered in the University of St. Andrews in the Year 1920*, Oxford 1921.
- Faure, P., *Le mont Iouktas, tombeau de Zeus*, in E. Grumach (Hrsg.), *Minoica. Festschrift zum 80. Geburtstag von J. Sundwall*, Berlin 1958 (Deutsche Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin, Schriften der Sektion für Altertumswissenschaft 12), pp. 133–148.
- , *Fonctions des cavernes crétoises*, Paris 1964 (École Française d'Athènes, Travaux et Mémoires 14).
- , *La vie quotidienne en Crète au temps de Minos (1500 avant J.-C.)*, Paris 1973.
- , *Nouvelles identifications d'antiques localités crétoises*, „Kadmos" 32, 1993, pp. 67–74.
- Fauth, W., *Asklepios*, KP I, 1964, coll. 644–648.
- , *Kulinarisches und Utopisches in der griechischen Komödie*, WSt 86, 1973, pp. 39–62.
- , *Utopische Inseln in den „Wahren Geschichten" des Lukian*, „Gymnasium" 86, 1979, pp. 39–58.
- , *Das Kasion-Gebirge und Zeus Kasios. Die antike Tradition und ihre vorderorientalischen Grundlagen*, „Ugarit-Forschungen" 22, 1990, pp. 105–118.
- Fears, J.R., *Herrscherkult*, RAC XIV, 1988, coll. 1047–1093.
- Federico, E., A. Visconti (ed.), *Epimenide cretese*, Napoli 2001 (Quaderni del Dipartimento di Discipline Storiche "E. Lepore" dell'Università "Federico II" 2).
- Feeney, D.C., *Towards an Account of the Ancient World's Concepts of Fictive Belief*, in Ch. Gill, T.P. Wiseman (eds), *Lies and Fiction in the Ancient World*, Exeter 1993, pp. 230–244.
- Fehling, D., *Herodotus and His "Sources". Citation, Invention and Narrative Art*. Translated from the German by J.G. Howie, Leeds 1989 (ARCA 21).
- Feldman, L.H., *Abraham the Greek Philosopher in Iosephus*, TAPhA 99, 1968, pp. 143–156.
- , *Jew and Gentile in the Ancient World. Attitudes and Interactions from Alexander to Justinian*, Princeton 1993.
- Ferguson, J., *Utopias of the Classical World*, London 1975 (Aspects of Greek and Roman Life).
- Ferrandini Troisi, F., *La divinizzazione di Alessandro Magno. Testimonianze epigrafiche*, "Epigraphica" 67, 2005, pp. 23–34.
- Festugière, A.-J., *Épique et ses dieux*, Paris 1946.
- , *À propos des aréologies d'Isis*, HThR 42, 1949, 209–234, reprint in *idem, Études de religion (...)*, pp. 138–163.
- , *La révélation d'Hermès Trismegiste*, I-II, Paris 1950 (reprint Paris 1989–1990, Collection d'Études Anciennes. Série grecque 75–76).
- , *Lieux communs littéraires et thèmes de folk-lore dans l'hagiographie primitive*, WSt 73, 1960, 123–152, reprint in *idem, Études de religion (...)*, 271–301, esp. pp. 272–274 ("Découverte d'un vieil écrit").
- , *Études de religion grecque et hellénistique*, Paris 1972 (Bibliothèque d'Histoire de la Philosophie).
- Figueira, Th.J., *The Lipari Islanders and their System of Communal Property*, ClAnt 3, 1984, pp. 179–206.

- Finley, M.I., *Utopianism Ancient and Modern*, in *The Critical Spirit. Essays in Honor of H. Marcuse*, ed. by K.H. Wolff and B. Moore, Boston 1967, pp. 3–20, reprint in *idem, The Use and Abuse of History*, London 1975, pp. 178–192.
- Fishwick, D., *The Imperial Cult in the Latin West. Studies in the Ruler Cult of the Western Provinces of the Roman Empire*, I–II, Leiden-New York-København-Köln 1987–1992 (EPRO 108).
- Flower, M.A., *Agasilaus of Sparta and the Origins of the Ruler Cult*, CQ 38, 1988, pp. 123–134.
- Foertmeyer, V., *The Dating of the Pompe of Ptolemy II Philadelphus*, “Historia” 37, 1988, pp. 90–104.
- Fornara, Ch.W., *FGrHist III C, fasc. 1: Commentary on nos. 608 a-608*, Leiden-New York-Köln 1994.
- Fornaro, S., *Herennios Philon*, DNP V, 1998, col. 410.
- Forstreuter, K., *Die deutsche Icherzählung. Eine Studie zu ihrer Geschichte und Technik*, Berlin 1924 (Germanische Studien 33) [reprint Nendeln-Liechtenstein 1967].
- Fowden, G., *The Egyptian Hermes. A Historical Approach to the Late Pagan Mind*, Princeton 1993.
- Fraenkel, E., *Additional Note on the Prose of Ennius*, “Eranos” 49, 1951, pp. 50–56, reprint in *idem, Kleine Beiträge zur klassischen Philologie*, II: *Zur römischen Literatur. Zu juristischen Texten. Verschiedenes*, Roma 1964, pp. 53–58.
- Fraser, P.M., *The Foundation-Date of the Alexandrian Ptolemaieia*, HThR 54, 1961, pp. 141–145.
- , *Current Problems Concerning the Early History of the Cult of Sarapis*, “Opuscula Atheniensia” 7, 1967, pp. 23–45.
- , *Ptolemaic Alexandria*, I–III, Oxford 1972 (reprint Oxford 1990).
- Fraser, P.M., E. Matthews, *A Lexicon of Greek Personal Names*, I–IV, Oxford 1987–2005.
- Fredricksmeyer, E. A., *Divine Honors for Philip II*, TAPhA 109, 1979, pp. 39–61.
- , *Three Notes on Alexander’s Deification*, AJAH 4, 1979, pp. 1–9.
- , *On the Background of the Ruler Cult*, in H.J. Dell (ed.), *Ancient Macedonian Studies in Honor of Ch. F. Edson*, Thessaloniki 1981 (Institute for Balkan Studies 158), pp. 145–156.
- , *On the Final Aims of Philip*, in W.L. Adams, E.N. Borza (eds), *Philip II, Alexander the Great and the Macedonian Heritage*, Washington 1982, pp. 85–98.
- , *Alexander’s Religion and Divinity*, in J. Roisman (ed.), *Brill’s Companion to Alexander the Great*, Leiden-Boston 2003, pp. 253–278.
- Fredouille, J.-C., *Götzendienst*, RAC XI, 1981, coll. 866–895.
- Freeman, K., *The Pre-Socratic Philosophers*, Cambridge, Mass. 1959.
- Freudenthal, J., *Hellenistische Studien*, Heft 1–2: *Alexander Polyhistor und die von ihm erhaltenen Reste jüdischer und samaritanischer Geschichtswerke*, Breslau 1874–1875 (Jahresbericht des jüdisch-theologischen Seminars „Fraenkel’scher Stiftung”).
- Frisk, H., *Griechisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*, I–III, Heidelberg 1960–1972.
- Fritz, K. von, *The Theory of the Mixed Constitution in Antiquity. An Analysis of the Sources*, New York 1940.
- , *Mathematiker und Akusmatiker bei den alten Pythagoreern*, München 1960 (SBAW, Philos.-hist. Kl. 1960, H. 11).
- Froidefond, Ch., *Le mirage égyptien dans la littérature grecque d’Homère à Aristote*, Aix-en-Provence 1971 (Publications Universitaires des Lettres et Sciences Humaines d’Aix-en-Provence).
- Fuchs, E., *Pseudologia. Formen und Funktionen fiktionaler Trugrede in der griechischen Literatur der Antike*, Heidelberg 1993 (Bibliothek der klassischen Altertumswissenschaften. NF 2. Reihe, Bd. 91).
- Funck, B., *Die Wurzeln der hellenistischen Euergetes-Religion im Staat und in den Städten des Seleukos Nikator*, in E.Ch. Welskopf (Hrsg.), *Hellenische Poleis. Krise – Wandlung – Wirkung*, III, Berlin 1974, pp. 1290–1334.

- , *Herrscherkult der Seleukiden – Religion einer Elite oder Reichsideologie?: einige Bemerkungen zur Fragestellung*, „Klio“ 73, 1991, pp. 402–407.
- Furley, W.D., J.M. Bremer, *Greek Hymns. Selected Cult Songs from the Archaic to the Hellenistic Period*, vol. I: *The Texts in Translation*, vol. II: *Greek Texts and Commentary*, Tübingen 2001 (Studien und Texte zu Antike und Christentum 9–10).
- Fusillo, M., *Le miroir de la Lune: L'Histoire vraie de Lucien: de la satire à l'utopie*, „Poétique“ 73, 1988, pp. 109–135.
- , *Euhemerios*, DNP IV, 1998, coll. 235–236.
- Gabba, E., *P. Cornelio Scipione Africano e la leggenda*, „Athenaeum“ 53, 1975, pp. 3–17.
- , *True History and False History in Classical Antiquity*, JRS 71, 1981, pp. 50–62, reprint in J. Marincola (ed.), *Greek and Roman Historiography*, Oxford 2011 (Oxford Readings in Classical Studies), pp. 337–361.
- Gärtner, H., *Dionysios Skytobrachion*, KP II, 1967, coll. 69–70.
- Gager, J.G., *Moses in Greco-Roman Paganism*, Nashville-New York 1972 (Society of Biblical Literature. Monograph Series 16).
- Gale, M., *Myth and Poetry in Lucretius*, Cambridge 1994 (Cambridge Classical Studies).
- Galinsky, G.K., *Scipionic Themes in Plautus' Amphitruo*, TAPhA 97, 1966, pp. 203–235.
- Gallist, B., *Teiresias in den Bakchen des Euripides*, Diss. Zürich, Würzburg 1979.
- Gamble, H.Y., *Euhemerism and Christology in Origen: Contra Celsum III* 22–43, VChr 33, 1979, pp. 12–29.
- Gaß, J.F., *Quaestiones Euhemereae*, in *Vierter Jahresbericht über das Gymnasium Thomaeum zu Kempen in dem Schuljahre 1859–1860*, Kempen 1860, pp. 1–27.
- Ganszyniec, R., *Der Ursprung der Zehngebote Tafeln. Eine Motivgeschichtliche Studie*, Berlin 1920.
- , *Der Ursprung der Zehngebote Tafeln*, ARW 22, 1923/24, pp. 352–356.
- , *Labraundos*, RE XII 1, 1924, coll. 277–282.
- Garbarino, G., *Roma e la filosofia greca dalle origini alla fine del II secolo a.C. Raccolta di testi con introduzione e commento*, I–II, Torino 1973 (Historica, Politica, Philosophica 6).
- Garlan, Y., *Les sociétés sans esclaves dans la pensée politique grecque*, „Klio“ 63, 1981, pp. 131–140. English version: *Slaveless Societies in Greek Political Thought*, in *eadem, Slavery in Ancient Greece*. Revised and Expanded Edition. Translated from the French by J. Lloyd, Ithaca-London 1988, pp. 126–138.
- Garland, R., *Introducing New Gods. The Politics of Athenian Religion*, London 1992.
- Garstad, B., *Belus in the Sacred History of Euhemerus*, CPh 99, 2004, pp. 246–257.
- Gatz, B., *Weltalter, goldene Zeit und sinnverwandte Vorstellungen*, Hildesheim 1967 (Spudasmata 16).
- Gauger, J.-D., *Sibyllinische Weissagungen*. Griechisch-deutsch. Auf der Grundlage der Ausgabe von A. Kurfess neu übersetzt und herausgegeben, Düsseldorf-Zürich 1998 (Sammlung Tusculum).
- Gauthier, Ph., *Les cités grecques et leurs bienfaiteurs (IV^e–I^{er} siècle avant J.-C.). Contribution à l'histoire des institutions*, Paris 1985, (BCH suppl. 12).
- Geffcken, J., *Die babylonische Sibylle*, Nachrichten von der Königlichen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen, Philol.-hist. Kl. 1900, pp. 88–102.
- , *Komposition und Entstehungszeit der Oracula Sibyllina*, Leipzig 1902 (TU NF VIII 1).
- , *Zwei griechische Apologeten*, Leipzig-Berlin 1907 (Sammlung wissenschaftlicher Kommentare zu griechischen und römischen Schriftstellern) [reprint Hildesheim 1970].
- , *Euhemerism*, ERE V, 1912, coll. 572–573.
- , *Leon von Pella*, RE XII 2, 1925, coll. 2012–2014.
- Gehrke, H.-J., *Der siegreiche König. Überlegungen zur hellenistischen Monarchie*, „Archiv für Kulturgeschichte“ 64, 1982, pp. 247–277.

- , *Bemerkungen zu Hippodamos von Milet*, in W. Schuler et al. (Hgg.), *Demokratie und Architektur. Der hippodamische Städtebau und die Entstehung der Demokratie*. Konstanzer Symposium vom 17. bis 19. Juli 1987, München 1989, pp. 58–63.
- , *Geschichte des Hellenismus*, 3., überarbeitete und erweiterte Auflage, München ³2003 (Oldenburg Grundriss der Geschichte 1 A).
- Gelzer, H., *Sextus Iulius Africanus und die byzantinische Chronographie*, I, Leipzig 1880.
- Georgiadou, A., D.H.J. Larmour, *Lucian's Science Fiction Novel True Histories. Interpretation and Commentary*, Leiden-Boston-Köln 1998 (Mnemosyne suppl. 179).
- Gernet, L., *La cité future et les pays des morts*, REG 46, 1933, pp. 293–310, reprint in *idem*, *Anthropologie de la Grèce antique*, Paris 1968, pp. 139–153. English version: *The City of the Future and the Land of Dead*, in *idem*, *The Anthropology of Ancient Greece*, Baltimore-London 1981, pp. 112–124.
- Gerson, L.P., *God and Greek Philosophy. Studies in the Early History of Natural Theology*, London-New York 1990.
- Gesche, H., *Die Vergottung Caesars*, Kallmünz 1968.
- Ghidini Tortorelli, M., *Miti e utopie nella Grecia antica*, Annali dell'Istituto Italiano per gli Studi Storici 5, 1976/1978 [1980], pp. 1–127.
- Giangrande, L., *Les utopies grecques*, REA 78/79, 1976/77, pp. 120–128.
- Giannantoni, G., *Socratis et Socraticorum reliquiae*. Collegit, disposuit, apparatus notisque instruxit, 1–4, Napoli 1990 (Elenchos. Collana di testi e studi sul pensiero antico 18).
- Gibson, M.D., *The Commentaries of Isho'dad of Merv, Bishop of Hadatha (c. 850 A.D.)*. In Syriac and English. Edited and Translated. With an Introduction by J.R. Harris, IV, Cambridge 1913 (Horae Semiticae 10).
- Gigon, O., *Die antike Kultur und das Christentum*, Gütersloh 1966 (²1971).
- Gigon, O., L. Straume-Zimmermann, *Marcus Tullius Cicero, Vom Wesen der Götter*. Lateinisch-deutsch. Herausgegeben, übersetzt und kommentiert, Zürich-Düsseldorf 1996 (Sammlung Tusculum).
- Gilbert, M., *La critique des dieux dans le Livre de la Sagesse (Sg 13–15)*, Rome 1973 (Analecta Biblica 53).
- Gill, D.H., *The Classical Greek Cult Table*, HSCPh 70, 1965, pp. 265–269.
- , *Greek Cult Tables*, New York-London 1991.
- Gils, P.J.M. van, *Quaestiones Euhemerae*, Diss. Amsterdam, Kerkrade-Heerlen 1902.
- Girard, J.-L., *Probabilisme, théologie et religion: le catalogue des dieux homonymes dans le De natura deorum de Cicéron (III 42 et 53–60)*, in *Hommages à R. Schilling*, édités par H. Zehnacker, G. Hentz, Paris 1983 (Collection d'Études Latines. Série scientifique 37), pp. 117–126.
- Gisinger, F., *Nikanor-Nikagoras*, RE Suppl. VIII, 1956, col. 363.
- Glaser, E., *Punt und die südarabischen Reiche*, Berlin 1899 (Mitteilungen der Vorderasiatischen Gesellschaft IV 2).
- , *Das Weihrauchland und Sokotra historisch beleuchtet*, München 1899 (Sonderabdruck aus der Beilage zur Allgemeinen Zeitung Nr. 120 und 121 vom 27. und 29. Mai 1899).
- Glaser, H.A., *Utopische Inseln. Beiträge zu ihrer Geschichte und Theorie*, Frankfurt a.M. et al. 1996.
- Goedicke, H., *Die Geschichte des Schiffbrüchigen*, Wiesbaden 1974 (Ägyptologische Abhandlungen 30).
- Gomperz, Th., *Griechische Denker. Eine Geschichte der antiken Philosophie*, I, Berlin-Leipzig ⁴1922 (reprint Berlin-New York 1973).
- Goodenough, E.R., *The Political Philosophy of the Hellenistic Kingship*, YCS 1, 1928, pp. 55–102; German version: *Die politische Philosophie des hellenistischen Königtums*, in H. Kloft (Hrsg.), *Ideologie und Herrschaft in der Antike*, Darmstadt 1979 (WdF 528), pp. 27–89.

- Goudineau, Ch. *Hierai trapezai*, in *Mélanges d'archéologie et d'histoire de l'École Française de Rome* 79, 1967, pp. 77–134.
- Goukowsky, P., *Essai sur les origines du mythe d'Alexandre (336–270 av. J.-C.)*, II: *Alexandre et Dionysos*, Nancy 1981.
- Goulet, R., *Évhémère de Messine*, DPhA III, 2000, pp. 403–411.
- , *La méthode allégorique chez les stoïciens*, in G. Romeyer Dherbey, J.-B. Gourinat (éds.), *Les Stoïciens*, Paris 2005 (Bibliothèque d'Histoire de la Philosophie. Nouvelle série), pp. 93–119.
- Goulon, A., *Les citations des poètes latins dans l'oeuvre de Lactance*, in J. Fontaine, M. Perrin (éds.), *Lactance et son temps. Recherches actuelles. Actes du IV^e colloque d'études historiques et patristiques, Chantilly 21–23 septembre 1976*, Paris 1978 (Théologie historique 48), pp. 107–156.
- Gourinat, J.-B., *Explicatio fabularum: La place de allégorie dans l'interprétation stoïcienne de la mythologie*, in G. Dahan, R. Goulet (éds.), *Allégorie des poètes. Allégorie des philosophes. Étude sur la poétique et l'herméneutique de l'allégorie de l'Antiquité à la Reforme. Table ronde internationale de Institut des traditions textuelles*, Paris 2005 (Texte et traditions 10), pp. 9–34.
- , *Persaios de Kition*, DPhA V a, 2012, pp. 234–243.
- Gove, Ph.B., *The Imaginary Voyage in Prose Fiction. A History and a Guide for its Study, with an Annotated Check List of 215 Imaginary Voyages from 1700 to 1800*, New York 1941.
- Gradel, I., *Emperor Worship and Roman Religion*, Oxford 2004.
- Graf, F., *Römische Aitia und ihre Riten. Das Beispiel von Saturnalia und Parilia*, MH 49, 1992, pp. 13–25.
- , *Greek Mythology. An Introduction*. Translated by Th. Marier, Baltimore-London 1993.
- , *Asklepios*, DNP II, 1997, coll. 94–99.
- Grandjean, Y., *Une nouvelle arétalogie d'Isis à Maronée*, Leiden 1975 (EPRO 49).
- Grant, R.M., *The Problem of Theophilus*, HThR 43, 1950, pp. 179–196.
- Gratwick, A. S., *The Minor Works of Ennius*, in *The Cambridge History of Classical Literature*, II: *Latin Literature*, ed. by E.J. Kenney and W.V. Clausen, Cambridge 1982, pp. 156–160.
- Graziosi, B., *Inventing Homer. The Early Reception of Epic*, Cambridge 2002 (Cambridge Classical Studies).
- Green, P., *Alexander to Actium. The Historical Evolution of the Hellenistic Age*, Berkeley-Los Angeles 1990.
- , *Delivering the Go(o)ds: Demetrius Poliorcetes and Hellenistic Divine Kingship*, in G.W. Bakewell, J.P. Sickinger (eds), *Gestures. Essays in Ancient History, Literature, and Philosophy Presented to A.L. Boegehold on the Occasion of His Retirement and His Seventy-fifth Birthday*, Oxford 2003, pp. 258–277.
- , *Diodorus Siculus, Books 11–12.37.1 Greek History 480–431 B.C. – the Alternative Version. Translated, with Introduction and Commentary*, Austin, Texas 2006.
- Griffiths, J.G., *Allegory in Greece and Egypt*, JEA 53, 1967, pp. 79–102, reprint in *idem, Atlantis and Egypt (...)*, pp. 295–324.
- , *Plutarch, De Iside et Osiride. Edited with Introduction, Translation and Commentary*, Cardiff 1970.
- , *Atlantis and Egypt*, “Historia” 34, 1985, pp. 3–28, reprint in *idem, Atlantis and Egypt (...)*, 3–30.
- , *Atlantis and Egypt with Other Selected Essays*, Cardiff 1991.
- Grilli, A., *Studi enniani*, Brescia 1965 (Pubblicazioni del Sodalizio Glottologico Milanese 3).
- Grimm, G., *Die Vergöttlichung Alexanders des Großen in Ägypten und ihre Bedeutung für den ptolemäischen Königs kult*, in H. Maehler, V.M. Strocka (Hgg.), *Das ptolemäische Ägypten. Akten des internationalen Symposiums 27.–29. September 1976 in Berlin*, Mainz 1978, pp. 103–112.
- Griset, F., *L'evemerismo in Roma*, “Rivista di studi classici” 7, 1959, pp. 65–68.

- Groom, N., *Frankincense and Myrrh. A Study of the Arabian Incense Trade*, London-New York-Beirut 1981.
- Gruen, E.S., *The Hellenistic World and the Coming of Rome*, I, Berkeley-Los Angeles-London 1984.
- , *Studies in Greek Culture and Roman Policy*, Leiden 1990 (Cincinnati Classical Studies 7) [reprint Berkeley-Los Angeles-London 1996].
- , *Jews, Greeks, and Romans in the Third Sibylline Oracle*, in M. Goodman (ed.), *Jews in a Graeco-Roman World*, Oxford 1998, pp. 15–36.
- Gruppe, O., *Die griechischen Culte und Mythen in ihren Beziehungen zu den orientalischen Religionen*, I, Leipzig 1887 (reprint Hildesheim-New York 1973).
- , *Griechische Mythologie und Religionsgeschichte*, I, München 1906.
- , *Geschichte der klassischen Mythologie und Religionsgeschichte während des Mittelalters im Abendland und während der Neuzeit*, Leipzig 1921 (RML suppl.).
- Grzybek, E., *Du calendrier macédonien au calendrier ptolémaïque. Problèmes de chronologie hellénistique*, Basel 1990 (Schweizerische Beiträge zur Altertumswissenschaft 20).
- Günther, L.-M., *Hellenistische Könige als Götter: das Beispiel der Ptolemäer*, in *Gottmenschen. Konzepte existenzieller Grenzüberschreitung im Altertum*, hrsg. von G. Binder, B. Effe, R.F. Gleis, Trier 2003 (BAC 55), pp. 9–26.
- Gundel, H., *T. Quinctius Flamininus*, RE XXIV 1, 1963, coll. 1047–1100.
- Guthrie, W.K.C., *In the Beginning. Some Greek Views on the Origins of Life and the Early State of Man*, London 1957.
- , *A History of Greek Philosophy*, II–III, Cambridge 1965–1969.
- Habicht, Ch., *Die herrschende Gesellschaft in den hellenistischen Monarchien*, „Vierteljahrschrift für Sozial- und Wirtschaftsgeschichte“ 45, 1958, pp. 1–16. English version: *The Ruling Class in the Hellenistic Monarchies*, in *idem, The Hellenistic Monarchies. Selected Papers*, Ann Arbor 2006, pp. 26–40.
- , *Gottmenschen und griechische Städte*. Zweite, durchgesehene Auflage mit einem Nachtrag, München 21970 (Zetemata 14).
- , *Untersuchungen zur politischen Geschichte Athens im 3. Jahrhundert v. Chr.*, München 1979 (Vestigia 30).
- , *Athen and the Ptolemies*, CAnt 11, 1992, pp. 68–90, reprint in *idem, Athen in hellenistischer Zeit*, München 1994, pp. 140–163.
- Hache, F., *Quaestiones archaicae*, Diss. Vratislaviae 1907, pp. 52–60 (De Ennii Euhemero).
- Hadzisteliou Price, Th., *Hero Cult in the “Age of Homer” and Earlier*, in *Arktouros. Studies Presented to B.M.W. Knox on the Occasion of His 65th Birthday*, ed. by G.W. Bowersock, W. Burkert, C.J. Putnam, Berlin-New York 1979, pp. 219–228.
- Hagendahl, H., *Augustine and the Latin Classics*, I–II, Göteborg 1967 (Studia Graeca et Latina Gothoburgensia XX 1–2).
- Hägg, R. (ed.), *Ancient Greek Hero Cult. Proceedings of the Fifth International Seminar on Ancient Greek Cult*, organized by the Department of Classical Archaeology and Ancient History, Göteborg University, 21–23 April 1995, Stockholm 1999 (Acta Instituti Atheniensis Regni Sueciae. Series in 8°, 16).
- Hägg, Th., *The Novel in Antiquity*, Oxford 1983.
- Hahn, D.E., *The Mixed Constitution in Greek Thought*, in R.K. Balot (ed.), *A Companion to Greek and Roman Political Thought*, Chichester 2009 (Blackwell Companions to the Ancient World), pp. 178–198.
- Hall, J., *Lucian's Satire*, New York 1981.
- Halm-Tisserant, M., *Cannibalisme et immortalité. L'enfant dans le chaudron en Grèce ancienne*, Paris 1993.
- Hamilton, C.D., *On the Perils of Extraordinary Honours: The Case of Lysander and Conon*, „Ancient World“ II 3, 1979, pp. 87–90.
- Hamilton, J.R., *The Origins of Ruler-Cult*, „Prudentia“ 16, 1984, pp. 3–15.

- Hammerstaedt, J., *Kallimachos*, RAC XIX, 2001, coll. 1207–1224.
- Hammond, N.G.L., G.T. Griffith, *A History of Macedonia*, II, Oxford 1979.
- Hani, J., *La religion égyptienne dans la pensée de Plutarque*, Paris 1976.
- Hansen, M.H. (ed.), *The Imaginary Polis. Symposium, January 7–10, 2004*, Copenhagen 2005 (Acts of the Copenhagen Polis Centre 7 = The Royal Danish Academy of Sciences and Letters, Historisk-filosofiske Meddelelser 91).
- Hanson, J.A., *Plautus as a Source Book for Roman Religion*, TAPhA 90, 1959, pp. 48–101.
- Hanson, R.P.C., *The Christian Attitude to Pagan Religions up to the Time of Constantine the Great*, ANRW II 23, 2, 1980, pp. 910–973, reprint in *idem, Studies in Christian Antiquity*, Edinburgh 1985, pp. 144–229.
- Harder, R., *Karpokrates von Chalkis und die memphitische Isispropaganda*, Berlin 1944 (Abhandlungen der Preußischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, Phil.-hist. Kl. 1943, 14).
- Harnack, A., *Der Vorwurf des Atheismus in den drei ersten Jahrhunderten*, TU NF XIII 4, 1905, pp. 3–16.
- Harris, J.R., *The Cretans Always Liars*, „Expositor“ 7. ser., vol. 2, 1906, pp. 305–317.
- , *A Further Note on the Cretans*, „Expositor“ 7. ser., vol. 3, 1907, pp. 332–337.
- , *St. Paul and Epimenides*, „Expositor“ 8. ser., vol. 4, 1912, pp. 348–353.
- Hasebroek, J., *Staat und Handel im alten Griechenland. Untersuchungen zur antiken Wirtschaftsgeschichte*, Tübingen 1928 (reprint Hildesheim 1966).
- Haß, P., *Der locus amoenus in der antiken Literatur: Zu Theorie und Geschichte eines literarischen Motivs*, Diss. Erlangen-Nürnberg, Bamberg 1998.
- Hauben, H., *Aspects du culte des souverains à l'époque des Lagides*, in L. Criscuolo, G. Geraci (ed.), *Egitto e storia antica dall'ellenismo all'età araba. Bilancio di un confronto. Atti del Colloquio Internazionale Bologna, 31 agosto – 2 settembre 1987*, Bologna 1989, pp. 441–467.
- Haussleiter, J., *Der Vegetarismus in der Antike*, Berlin 1935 (RGVV 24).
- Haywood, R.M., *Studies on Scipio Africanus*, Baltimore 1933 (John Hopkins University Studies in Historical and Political Science. Series LI, n. 1) [reprint Westport, Conn. 1973].
- Hazzard, R.A., *Did Ptolemy I Get His Surname from the Rhodians in 304?*, ZPE 93, 1992, pp. 52–56.
- , *Imagination of a Monarchy: Studies in Ptolemaic Propaganda*, Toronto-Buffalo-London 2000 (Phoenix supp. 37).
- Head, B.V., *Historia Numorum. A Manual of Greek Numismatics*. New and Enlarged Edition, Oxford 1911.
- Heckel, W., *The Marshals of Alexander's Empire*, London-New York 1992.
- , *Who's Who in the Age of Alexander the Great. Prosopography of Alexander's Empire*, Chichester 2009 (¹2006).
- Heinen, H., *The Syrian-Egyptian Wars and the New Kingdoms of Asia Minor*, CAH VII ¹, 1984, pp. 412–445.
- Heinimann, F., *Nomos und Physis. Herkunft und Bedeutung einer Antithese im griechischen Denken des 5. Jahrhunderts*, Basel 1945 (Schweizerische Beiträge zur Altertumswissenschaft 1) [reprint Darmstadt ⁵1987].
- Heitsch, E., *Die Entdeckung der Homonymie*, Wiesbaden 1972 (Akademie der Wissenschaften und der Literatur zu Mainz. Abhandlungen der Geistes- und Sozialwissenschaftlichen Klasse 1972, Nr. 11).
- Helck, W., *Wirtschaftsgeschichte des Alten Ägypten im 3. und 2. Jahrtausend vor Chr.*, Leiden-Köln 1975 (Handbuch der Orientalistik I 1, 5).
- Helm, R., *Pompeius Festus*, RE XXI 2, 1952, coll. 2316–2320.
- , *Der antike Roman*, Göttingen ²1956 (Studienhefte zur Altertumswissenschaft 4).
- Hengel, M., *Anonymität, Pseudepigraphie und „literarische Fälschung“ in der jüdisch-hellenistischen Literatur*, in *Pseudepigrapha I: Pseudopythgorica – Lettres de Pla-*

- ton, *Littérature pseudépigraphique juive*, Vandoeuvres-Genève 1972 (Entretiens sur l'Antiquité classique 18), pp. 229–308.
- , *Judentum und Hellenismus. Studien zu ihrer Begegnung unter besonderer Berücksichtigung Palästinas bis zur Mitte des 2. Jh. s v. Chr.* 3., durchgesehene Auflage, Tübingen 1988 (WUNT 10).
- Henrichs, A., *Two Doxographical Notes: Democritus and Prodicus on Religion*, HSCPh 79, 1975, pp. 93–127.
- , *The Atheism of Prodicus*, CrErc 6, 1976, pp. 15–21.
 - , *The Sophists and Hellenistic Religion: Prodicus as the Spiritual Father of the Isis Aretologies*, HSCPh 88, 1984, pp. 139–158.
 - , *Demythologizing the Past, Mythicizing the Present: Myth, History, and the Supernatural at the Dawn of the Hellenistic Period*, in R. Buxton (ed.), *From Myth to Reason? Studies in the Development of Greek Thought*, Oxford 1999, pp. 223–248.
 - , Hieroi Logoi und Hierai Bibloi: *The (Un)written Margins of the Sacred in Ancient Greece*, HSCPh 101, 2003, pp. 207–266.
 - , *What Is a Greek God?*, in J.N. Bremmer, A. Erskine (eds), *The Gods of Ancient Greece. Identities and Transformations*, Edinburgh 2010 (Edinburgh Leventis Studies 5), pp. 19–39.
- Herman, G., *The „Friends“ of the Early Hellenistic Rulers: Servants or Officials?*, „Talanta“ 12/13, 1980/1981, pp. 103–149.
- , *The Court Society of the Hellenistic Age*, in *Hellenistic Constructs. Essays in Culture, History, and Historiography*, ed. by P. Cartledge, P. Garnsey, E. Gruen, Berkeley-Los Angeles-London 1997 (Hellenistic Culture and Society 26), pp. 199–224.
- Herter, H., *Kallimachos*, RE Suppl. V, 1931, coll. 386–452.
- , *Xanthos der Lyder*, RE IX A 2, 1967, coll. 1353–1374.
 - , *Kallimachos*, RE Suppl. XIII, 1973, coll. 184–266.
- Herz, P., *Hellenistische Könige. Zwischen griechischen Vorstellungen vom Königtum und Vorstellungen ihrer einheimischen Untertanen*, in A. Small (ed.), *Subject and Ruler: The Cult of the Ruling Power in Classical Antiquity*. Papers Presented at the Conference Held in the University of Alberta on April 13–15, 1994, to Celebrate the 65th Anniversary of D. Fishwick, Ann Arbor 1996 (JRA Suppl. 17), pp. 27–40.
- Herzhoft, B., *Index der Pflanzen und ihrer Erzeugnisse*, in U. Eigler, G. Wöhrle, *Theophrast, De odoribus*. Edition, Übersetzung, Kommentar, Stuttgart 1993 (Beiträge zur Altertumskunde 37), pp. 78–95.
- Herzog, R. (Hrsg.), *Restauration und Erneuerung. Die lateinische Literatur von 284 bis 374 n. Chr.*, München 1989 (HLL 5).
- Heuten, G., *Julius Firmicus Maternus, De errore profanarum religionum. Traduction nouvelle avec texte et commentaire*, Bruxelles 1938 (Travaux de la Faculté de Philosophie et Lettres de l'Université de Bruxelles 8).
- Hintzen-Bohlen, B., *Die Familiengruppe – ein Mittel zur Selbstdarstellung*, JDAI 105, 1990, pp. 129–154.
- , *Herrscherrepräsentation im Hellenismus. Untersuchungen zu Weihegeschenken, Stifungen und Ehrenmonumenten in den mütterländischen Heiligtümern Delphi, Olympia, Delos und Dodona*, Köln-Weimar-Wien 1992.
- Hirzel, R., *Untersuchungen zu Cicero's philosophischen Schriften*, II, Leipzig 1882 (reprint Hildesheim 1964).
- , *Der Dialog. Ein literarhistorischer Versuch*, I, Leipzig 1895 (reprint Hildesheim 1963).
 - , *Die Homonymie der griechischen Götter nach der Lehre antiker Theologen*, Berichte über die Verhandlungen der Königl. Sächsischen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Leipzig, Philol.-hist. Cl. 48, 1896, pp. 277–337.
- Hitzl, K., *Drei Beiträge zu Olympia*, „Boreas“ 18, 1995, pp. 5–12.
- Hocheisel, K., *Das Urteil über die nichtchristlichen Religionen im Traktat De errore profanarum religionum des Firmicus Maternus*, Diss. Bonn 1972.

- Hodkinson, S., *Social Order and the Conflict of Values in Classical Sparta*, „Chiron“ 13, 1983, pp. 239–281.
- Hoefel, U., *Pontosvoelker, Ephoros und Apollonios von Rhodos*, RhM 59, 1904, pp. 541–564.
- Högemann, P., *Alexander der Große und Arabien*, München 1985 (Zetemata 82).
- Hölbl, G., *Geschichte des Ptolemäerreiches. Politik, Ideologie und religiöse Kultur von Alexander dem Großen bis zur römischen Eroberung*, Darmstadt 1994. English version: *A History of the Ptolemaic Empire*, London 2001.
- Hölscher, U., *Die Odyssee. Epos zwischen Märchen und Roman*, München 1988.
- Hoffmann, K.F., *Das Recht im Denken der Sophistik*, Stuttgart-Leipzig 1997 (Beiträge zur Altertumskunde 104).
- Holladay, C.R., *Fragments from Hellenistic Jewish Authors, I: Historians*, Chico, California 1983 (Pseudoepigrapha Series 10).
- , *Fragments from Hellenistic Jewish Authors, II: Poets*, Atlanta 1989 (Pseudoepigrapha Series 12).
- Holt, Ph., *Herakles' Apotheosis in Lost Greek Literature and Art*, AC 61, 1992, pp. 38–56.
- Holzberg, N., *Der antike Roman. Eine Einführung*. 3. überarbeitete Auflage, Darmstadt 2006.
- , *Novel-like Works of Extended Prose Fiction, II: A. Utopias and Fantastic Travel: Euhemerus, Iambulus*, in G. Schmeling, (ed.), *The Novel in the Ancient World*, Boston-Leiden 2003, pp. 621–628. German version: *Romanhafte Erzählprosa in der griechischen Literatur*, „Anregung“ 39, 1993, pp. 243–254, esp. pp. 244–250 („Zwei Vorläufer des utopischen Romans: Die Inselbeschreibung des Euhemerus und des Iambulos“).
- Holtzman, B., *Asklepios*, LIMC II 1, 1984, pp. 863–897.
- Homann-Wedeking, E., *Samos 1964*, AA 80, 1965, pp. 428–446.
- Hommel, F., *Die Insel der Seligen in Mythos und Sage der Vorzeit*, München 1901.
- , *Ethnologie und Geographie des alten Orients*, München 1926 (HdA III 1, 1).
- Honigman, S., *Euhemerus of Messene and Plato's Atlantis*, „Historia“ 58, 2009, pp. 1–35.
- Hordern, J., *Philodemus and the Poems of Diogenes*, ZPE 136, 2001, pp. 33–38.
- Horn, H.-J., *Gottesbeweis*, RAC XI, 1981, coll. 951–977.
- Hornbostel, W., *Sarapis. Studien zur Überlieferungsgeschichte, den Erscheinungsformen und Wandlungen der Gestalt eines Gottes*, Leiden 1973 (EPRO 32).
- Hubaux, J., *Les grands mythes de Rome*, Paris 1945.
- Hüsing, G., *Panchaia*, in H. Mžik (Hrsg.), *Beiträge zur historischen Geographie, Kulturgeographie, Ethnographie und Kartographie, vornehmlich des Orients*, Leipzig-Wien 1929, pp. 99–111.
- Hunger, H., *Allegorische Mythendeutung in der Antike und bei Johannes Tzetzes*, „Jahrbuch der Österreichischen Gesellschaft“ 3, 1954, pp. 34–54.
- Hunter, R., *Theocritus. Encomium of Ptolemy Philadelphus. Text and Translation with Introduction and Commentary*, Berkeley-Los Angeles-London 2003 (Hellenistic Culture and Society 39).
- Huonder, Q., *Gott und Seele im Lichte der griechischen Philosophie*, München 1954.
- Huß, W., *Der makedonische König und die ägyptischen Priester. Studien zur Geschichte des ptolemäischen Ägypten*, Stuttgart 1994 (Historia Einzelschriften 85).
- , *Ägypten in hellenistischer Zeit 323–30 v. Chr.*, München 2001.
- Huttner, U., *Die politische Rolle der Heraklesgestalt im griechischen Herrschertum*, Stuttgart 1997 (Historia Einzelschriften 112).
- Hutton, J.H., *Caste in India. Its Nature, Functions, and Origins*, Oxford 1946.
- Huwendiek, J., *Zur Interpretation des Philippeion in Olympia*, „Boreas“ 19, 1996, pp. 155–159.
- Huxley, G.L., *Greek Epic Poetry*, London 1969.
- Immisch, O., *Zum antiken Herrscherkult*, Leipzig 1931.
- Isaac, B., *Trade-Routes to Arabia and the Roman Presence in the Desert*, in T. Fahd (éd.), *L'Arabie préislamique et son environnement historique et culturel*, Leiden 1989

- (Université des Sciences Humaines de Strasbourg. Travaux du Centre de Recherche sur le Proche-Orient et la Grèce antiques 10), pp. 241–256.
- Jachmann, G., *Calabrae Pierides*, „Philologus“ 90, 1935, pp. 331–351.
- Jacobs, B., *Das Heiligtum auf dem Nemrud Dağı. Zur Baupolitik des Antiochos I. von Kommagene und seines Sohnes Mithridates II.*, in J. Wagner (Hrsg.), *Gottkönige am Euphrat. Neue Ausgrabungen und Forschungen in Kommagene*, Mainz 2000 (Antike Welt. Sonderband), pp. 27–35.
- , *Die Religionspolitik des Antiochos I. von Kommagene*, in J. Wagner (Hrsg.), *Gottkönige am Euphrat* (...), pp. 45–49.
- Jacobson, H., *The Exagoge of Ezekiel*, Cambridge 1983.
- Jacoby, F., *Euemerios*, RE VI 1, 1907, coll. 952–972, reprint in *idem.*, *Griechische Historiker*, Stuttgart 1956, pp. 175–185.
- , *Eupolemos*, RE VI 1, 1907, coll. 1227–1229.
- , *Hekataios*, RE VII 2, 1912, coll. 2750–2769, reprint in *idem.*, *Griechische Historiker* (...), pp. 227–237.
- , *Diagoras ó Ἀθεός*, Berlin 1959 (Abhandlungen der Deutschen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin, Klasse für Sprachen, Literatur und Kunst 1959, 3).
- Jaeger, W., *Diokles von Karystos. Die griechische Medizin und die Schule des Aristoteles*, Berlin 1938 (²1963), esp. pp. 134–153 („Theophrast und der älteste griechische Bericht über die Juden“).
- , *Greeks and Jews. The First Greek Records of Jewish Religion and Civilization*, „Journal of Religion“ 18, 1938, pp. 127–143, reprint in *idem.*, *Scripta Minora*, II, Roma 1960 (Storia e letteratura 81), pp. 169–183.
- , *Die Theologie der frühen griechischen Denker*, Stuttgart 1953 (reprint Darmstadt 1964); English version: *The Theology of Early Greek Philosophers*, Oxford 1947.
- Jocelyn, H.D., *The Tragedies of Ennius. The Fragments Edited with an Introduction and Commentary*, Cambridge 1967 (Cambridge Classical Texts and Commentaries 10).
- , *The Poems of Quintus Ennius*, ANRW I 2, 1972, pp. 987–1026.
- , *Ennius*, OCD ³1996, pp. 525–526.
- Joël, K., *Geschichte der antiken Philosophie*, I, Tübingen 1921.
- Johnson, C., *Ptolemy I' Epiklesis Σωτήρ: Origin and Definition*, AHB 14, 2000, pp. 102–106.
- Johnston, P.A., *Vergil's Conception of Saturnus*, CSCA 10, 1977, pp. 57–70.
- , *Vergil's Agricultural Golden Age. A Study of Georgics*, Leiden 1980 (Mnemosyne suppl. 60).
- Jones, J.W., *Allegorical Interpretation in Servius*, CJ 56, 1960/1961, pp. 173–178.
- Joosen, J.C., J.H. Waszink, *Allegorese*, RAC I, 1950, coll. 283–293.
- Jung, C.G., K. Kerényi, *Das göttliche Kind in mythologischer und psychologischer Beleuchtung*, Leipzig 1940.
- Kaerst, J., *Geschichte des Hellenismus*, II, Leipzig-Berlin ²1926 (reprint Stuttgart 1969).
- Kahn, Ch.H., *Greek Religion and Philosophy in the Sisyphus Fragment*, „Phronesis“ 42, 1997, pp. 247–263.
- Kákosy, L., *Horusstele*, Lex. Ägypt. III, 1980, coll. 60–62.
- , *Metternichstele*, Lex. Ägypt. IV, 1982, coll. 122–124.
- Kan, C.M., *Disputatio de Euhemero*, Diss. Groningae 1862.
- Kannicht, R., *Zum Corpus Euripideum*, in Ch. Müller-Goldingen, K. Sier (Hgg.), *AHNAIKA. Festschrift für C.W. Müller zum 65. Geburtstag am 28. Januar 1996*, Stuttgart-Leipzig 1996 (Beiträge zur Altertumskunde 89), pp. 21–31.
- Kappelmacher, A., *Die Literatur der Römer bis zur Karolingerzeit*. Nach dem Ableben des Verfassers beendet von M. Schuster, Potsdam 1926 (Handbuch der Literaturwissenschaft 7) [reprint 1934].
- Karetsou, A., *The Peak Sanctuary of Mt. Juktas*, in R. Hägg, N. Marinatos (eds), *Sanctuaries and Cults in the Aegean Bronze Age*. Proceedings of the First International Symposium at the Swedish Institute in Athens, 12–13 May 1980, Stockholm 1981 (Acta Instituti Athen. Regni Sueciae. Ser. in. 4^o, 28), pp. 137–153.

- Karttunen, K., *India and the Hellenistic World*, Helsinki 1997 (Studia Orientalia 83).
- Kattenbusch, *Die Entstehung einer christlichen Theologie. Zur Geschichte der Ausdrücke θεολογία, θεολογεῖν, θεολόγος*, „Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche“ NF 11, 1930, pp. 161–205 (published as a book Darmstadt 1962).
- Kazarow, G., *Der liparische Kommunistenstaat*, „Philologus“ 62, 1903, pp. 157–160.
- Kearns, E., *Between God and Man: Status and Function of Heroes and Their Sanctuaries*, in *Le sanctuaire grec*, Vandoeuvers-Genève 1992 (Entretiens sur l'Antiquité Classique 37), pp. 65–99.
- Kees, H., *Das Priestertum im Ägyptischen Staat vom Neuen Reich bis zur Spätzeit*, I–II, Leiden-Köln 1953–1958.
- Kehl, H., *Die Monarchie im politischen Denken des Isokrates*, Diss. Bonn 1962.
- Kerckhecker, A., *Callimachus' Book of Iambi*, Oxford 1999.
- Kerényi, K., *Die griechisch-orientalische Romanliteratur in religionsgeschichtlicher Beleuchtung*, Tübingen 1927 (²1962).
- Kern, O., *Epimenides*, RE VI 1, 1909, coll. 173–178.
- , *Die Religion der Griechen*, I–III, Berlin 1926–1935–1938 (Berlin ²1963).
- Kertész, I., *Bemerkungen zum Kult des Demetrios Poliorketes*, „Oikumene“ 2, 1978, pp. 163–175.
- Kindstrand, J.F., *Anacharsis. The Legend and the Apophthegmata*, Uppsala 1981 (Acta Universitatis Upsaliensis. Studia Graeca Upsaliensia 16).
- Kirk, G.S., J.E. Raven, M. Schofield, *The Presocratic Philosophers*, Cambridge ²1983.
- Kivilo, M., *Early Greek Poet's Lives. The Shaping of the Tradition*, Leiden-Boston 2010 (Mnemosyne suppl. 322).
- Kleingünther, A., *ΠΡΩΤΟΣ ΕΥΡΕΤΗΣ. Untersuchungen zur Geschichte einer Fragestellung*, Leipzig 1933 (Philologus Supplbd. XXVI 1).
- Kleinknecht, H., *θεός und θεῖος*, ThWNT III, 1938, coll. 65–79, 122–123.
- Klotz, A., *Studien zu Polybios*, „Hermes“ 80, 1952, esp. pp. 334–343 („Die Eroberung von Neukarthago durch Scipio“).
- Knaack, G., *Antiphanes von Berge*, RhM 61, 1906, pp. 135–138.
- Knoche, U., *Die römische Satire*, Göttingen ⁴1982.
- Koch, K., *Hazzi – Şafön – Kasion. Die Geschichte eines Berges und seiner Gottheiten*, in B. Janowski et al. (Hgg.), *Religionsgeschichtliche Beziehungen zwischen Kleinasien, Nordsyrien und dem Alten Testament. Internationales Symposium Hamburg 17.-21. März 1990*, Freiburg, Schweiz-Göttingen 1993 (Orbis Biblicus und Orientalis 129), pp. 171–223.
- Koch, M., *Zur Utopie in der Alten Welt*, in *Auf den Weg gebracht. Idee und Wirklichkeit der Gründung der Universität Konstanz. Festschrift für K.G. Kiesinger*, hrsg. von H. Sund, M. Timmermann, Konstanz 1979, pp. 399–417.
- Köhler, J., *Pompai. Untersuchungen zur hellenistischen Festkultur*, Frankfurt a. M. 1996.
- Koenen, L., *Die Adaption ägyptischer Königsideologie am Ptolemäerhof, in Egypt and the Hellenistic World. Proceedings of the International Colloquium, Leuven, 24–26 May 1982*, ed. by E. van't Dack, P. van Dessel, W. van Gucht, Louvain 1983 (Studia Hellenistica 27), pp. 143–190.
- , *The Ptolemaic King as a Religious Figure*, in *Images and Ideologies. Self-definition in the Hellenistic World*, ed. by A. Bulloch, E.S. Gruen, A.A. Long, A. Stewart, Berkeley-Los Angeles-London 1993 (Hellenistic Culture and Society 12), pp. 25–115.
- Kötting, B., *Euergetes*, RAC VI, 1966, coll. 849–856.
- Kokolakis, M., *Zeus' Tomb. An Object of Pride and Reproach*, „Kernos“ 8, 1995, pp. 123–138.
- Koning, H.H., *Hesiod: The Other Poet. Ancient Reception of a Cultural Icon*, Leiden-Boston 2010 (Mnemosyne suppl. 325).
- Kornemann, E., *Zur Geschichte der antiken Herrscherkulte*, „Klio“ 1, 1901, pp. 51–146.
- Kotsidou, H., *ΤΙΜΗ ΚΑΙ ΔΟΞΑ. Ehrungen hellenistischer Herrscher im griechischen Mutterland und in Kleinasien unter besonderer Berücksichtigung der archäologischen Denkmäler*, Berlin 2000.

- Koulakiotis, E., *Genese und Metamorphosen des Alexandermythos im Spiegel der griechischen nichthistoriographischen Überlieferung bis zum 3. Jh. n. Chr.*, Konstanz 2006 (Xenia. Konstanzer Althistorische Vorträge und Forschungen 47).
- Krahner, L., *Grundlinien zur Geschichte des Verfalls der römischen Staatsreligion bis auf die Zeit des August. Eine litterarhistorische Abhandlung*, Halle 1837 (Programm der Lateinischen Hauptschule zu Halle), pp. 20–45.
- Kremmer, M., *De catalogis heurematum*, Diss. Leipzig 1890.
- Kreutz, N., *Zeus und die griechischen Poleis. Topographische und religionsgeschichtliche Untersuchungen von archaischer bis in hellenistische Zeit*, Rahden/Westf. 2007 (Tübinger Archäologische Forschungen 3).
- Krewitt, U., *Allegorese außerchristlicher Texte (Mittelalter)*, Theologische Realenzyklopädie II, 1978, pp. 284–290.
- Kroll, W., *Hermes Trismegistos*, RE VIII 1, 1912, coll. 792–823.
- , *Arnobiusstudien*, RhM 72, 1917/1918, pp. 62–112.
- , *Nikagoras* 7, RE XVII 1, 1936, col. 216.
- Krug, H., *Der Stil im Euhemerus des Ennius*, Diss. Breslau 1944 (typescript).
- , *Zum Text von Ennius' Euhemerus*, „Forschungen und Fortschritte“ 24, 1948, pp. 57–59.
- Kubitschek, W., *Kastor von Rhodos*, RE X 2, 1919, coll. 2347–2357.
- Kuch, H., *Funktionswandlungen des antiken Romans*, in *idem*, *Der antike Roman. Untersuchungen zur literarischen Kommunikation und Gattungsgeschichte*, Berlin 1989 (Veröffentlichungen des Zentralinstituts für Alte Geschichte und Archäologie der Akademie der Wissenschaften der DDR 19), pp. 52–81.
- , *A Study on the Margin of the Ancient Novel: „Barbarians and Others“*, in G. Schmelting (ed.), *The Novel in the Ancient World*, Boston-Leiden 2003, pp. 209–220.
- Kuhnert, E., *Perseus*, RML III, 1897–1909, coll. 1986–2060.
- Kuiper, K., *Studia Callimachea*, II: *De Callimachi theologumenis*, Lugduni Batavorum 1898.
- , *De Ezechiele poeta Iudaeo*, „Mnemosyne“ 28, 1900, pp. 237–280.
- Kurth, *Thot*, in *Lex. Ägypt.* VI, 1986, coll. 497–523.
- Kytzler, B., *Utopisches Denken und Handeln in der klassischen Antike*, in *Der utopische Roman*, hrsg. von R. Villgrader, F. Krey, Darmstadt 1973, pp. 45–68.
- Laager, J., *Geburt und Kindheit des Gottes in der griechischen Mythologie*, Winterthur 1957.
- Lachmann, K., *Horatiana*, „Philologus“ 1, 1846, pp. 164–166, reprint in *idem*, *Kleinere Schriften zur classischen Philologie*, hrsg. von J. Vahlen, Berlin 1876, pp. 96–100.
- Lacroix, L., *Quelques exemples de disparitions miraculeuses dans les traditions de la Grèce ancienne*, in *Mélanges Pierre Lévêque* édités par M.-M. Mactoux, E. Geny, vol. I: *Religion*, Paris 1988 (Annales Littéraires de l'Université de Besançon 367. Centre de Recherches d'Histoire Ancienne 79), pp. 183–198.
- Lämmle, R., *Das Satyrspiel*, in *Die Literatur der archaischen und klassischen Zeit*, hrsg. von B. Zimmermann, München 2011 (HGL I), pp. 611–663.
- Lätsch, F., *Insularität und Gesellschaft in der Antike. Untersuchungen zur Auswirkung der Insellage auf die Gesellschaftsentwicklung*, Stuttgart 2005 (Geographica Historica 19).
- Lanczkowski, G., *Die Geschichte des Schiffbrüchigen*, ZDMG 103, 1953, pp. 360–371.
- , *Parallelmotive zu einer altägyptischen Erzählung*, ZDMG 105, 1955, pp. 239–260.
- , *Die Inseln der Seligen und verwandte Vorstellungen*, Frankfurt a.M-Bern-New York 1986 (Europäische Hochschulschriften. Reihe XXIII: Theologie, Bd. 261).
- Landucci Gattinoni, F., *La divinizzazione di Demetrio e la coscienza ateniese*, in M. Sordi (ed.), *Religione e politica nel mondo antico*, Milano 1981, pp. 115–123.
- , *Duride di Samo*, Roma 1997.
- , *L'arte del potere. Vita e opere di Cassandro di Macedonia*, Stuttgart 2003 (Historia Einzelschriften 171).

- Lanfranchi, P., *L'Exagoge d'Ezechiel le Tragique. Introduction, texte, traduction et commentaire*, Leiden-Boston 2006 (Studia in Veteris Testamenti Pseudepigrapha 21).
- Langer, C., *Euhemerus und die Theorie der φύσει und θέσει θεοί*, „ΑΓΓΕΛΟΣ. Archiv für neutestamentliche Zeitgeschichte und Kulturkunde“ 2, 1926, pp. 53–59.
- Langerbeck, H., *Die Vorstellung vom Schlaraffenland in der alten attischen Komödie*, „Zeitschrift für Volkskunde“ 59, 1963, pp. 192–204.
- Lanzillotta, L.R., *Christian Apocrysts and Greek Gods*, in J.N. Bremmer, A. Erskine (eds), *The Gods of Ancient Greece. Identities and Transformations*, Edinburgh 2010 (Edinburgh Leventis Studies 5), pp. 442–464.
- Lapatin, K., *Chryselephantine Statuary in the Ancient Mediterranean World*, Oxford 2001.
- , *New Statues for Old Gods*, in J.N. Bremmer, A. Erskine (eds), *The Gods of Ancient Greece. Identities and Transformations*, Edinburgh 2010 (Edinburgh Leventis Studies 5), pp. 126–151.
- La Penna, A., *Brevi considerazioni sulla divinizzazione degli eroi e sul canone degli eroi divinizzati*, in *Res sacrae. Hommages à H. Le Bonniec* publiés par D. Porte, J.P. Néraudau, Bruxelles 1988, pp. 275–287.
- Laqueur, R., *Manethon*, RE XIV 1, 1928, coll. 1060–1101.
- , *Mnaseas*, RE XV 2, 1932, coll. 2250–2253.
- , *Thallos I*, RE V A 1, 1934, coll. 1225–1226.
- , *Theodotos 21*, RE V A 1, 1934, coll. 1958–1959.
- , *Diodorea*, „Hermes“ 86, 1958, pp. 257–290.
- Latte, K., *Römische Religionsgeschichte*, München 1960 (HdA V 4).
- Lauer, J.-Ph., C. Picard, *Les statues ptolémaïques du Sarapieion de Memphis*, Paris 1955 (Publications de l'Institut d'Art et d'Archéologie de l'Université de Paris 3).
- Laughton, E., *The Prose of Ennius*, „Eranos“ 49, 1951, pp. 35–49.
- Lausberg, M., *Untersuchungen zu Senecas Fragmenten*, Berlin 1970 (UaLG 7).
- Lease, E.B., *The Number Three, Mysterious, Mystic, Magic*, CPh 14, 1919, pp. 56–73.
- Leclant, J., G. Clerc, *Ammon*, LIMC I 1, 1981, pp. 666–689.
- Lefantzis, M., J.T. Jensen, *The Athenian Asklepieion on the South Slope of the Akropolis: Early Development, ca. 420–360 B.C.*, in *Aspects of Ancient Greek Cult. Context, Ritual and Iconography*, ed. by J.T. Jensen, G. Hinge, P. Schultz, B. Wickkiser, Aarhus 2009 (Aarhus Studies in Mediterranean Antiquity 8), pp. 91–124.
- Lefkowitz, M.R., *'Impiety' and 'Atheism' in Euripides' Dramas*, CQ 39, 1989, pp. 70–82.
- Lehmann, Y., *Varron théologien et philosophe romain*, Bruxelles 1997 (Collection Latomus 237).
- Lenchantin de Gubernatis, M., *Appunti sull'ellenismo nella poesia arcaica latina*, Memorie della Reale Accademia delle Scienze di Torino, Serie 2, Cl. di Scienze morali, storiche e filologiche 68, 1913, pp. 426–431.
- Leo, F., *Geschichte der römischen Literatur*, I: *Die archaische Literatur*, Berlin 1913 (reprint Dublin-Zürich³ 1967).
- Le Rider, G., *Monnaies crétoises du I^{er} au I^{er} siècle av. J.-C.*, Paris 1966 (École Française d'Athènes. Études crétoises 15).
- Le Roux, F.M., *Les îles au Nord du Monde*, in M. Rénard (éd.), *Hommages à A. Grenier*, II, Bruxelles-Berchem 1962 (Collection Latomus 58), pp. 1051–1062.
- Lersch, L., *De Ennii Scipione*, RhM 5, 1837, pp. 416–421.
- Leschhorn, W., „Gründer der Stadt“. *Studien zu einem politisch-religiösen Phänomen der griechischen Geschichte*, Stuttgart 1984 (Palingenesia 20).
- Lesky, A., *Geschichte der griechischen Literatur*, Bern-München³ 1971.
- Lévéque, P., A. Verbanck-Piérard, *„Héraclès héros ou dieu?“*, in C. Bonnet, C. Jourdain-Annequin (éds), *Héraclès. D'une rive à l'autre de la Méditerranée. Bilan et perspectives*, Bruxelles-Rome 1992, pp. 43–65.
- Lieberg, G., *Die „theologia tripertita“ in Forschung und Bezeugung*, ANRW I 4, 1973, pp. 63–115.

- , *Die Theologia tripertita als Formprinzip antiken Denkens*, RhM 125, 1982, pp. 25–53.
- Liebeschuetz, J.H.W.G., *Continuity and Change in Roman Religion*, Oxford 1979 (reprint 1996).
- Lightfoot, J.L., *The Sibylline Oracles. With Introduction, Translation, and Commentary on the First and Second Books*, Oxford 2007.
- , *Pseudo-Meliton and the Cults of the Roman Near East*, in *Les religions orientales dans le monde grec et romain cent ans après Cumont (1906–2006). Bilan historique et historiographique. Colloque de Rome, 16–18 novembre 2006*, éd. C. Bonnet, V. Pirenne-Delforge, D. Praet, Bruxelles-Rome 2009 (Institut Historique Belge de Rome. Études de Philologie, d'Archéologie et d'Histoire Anciennes 45), pp. 387–399.
- Lilja, S., *The Treatment of Odours in the Poetry of Antiquity*, Helsinki 1972 (Commentationes Humanarum Litterarum 49).
- Lincoln, B., *On the Imagery of Paradise*, “Indogermanische Forschungen” 85, 1980, pp. 151–164.
- Link, S., *Aristoteles, Ephoros und die ‘Kretische Verfassung’*, “Gymnasium” 115, 2008, pp. 469–479.
- Lintott, A.W., *The Theory of the Mixed Constitution at Rome*, in J. Barnes, M. Griffin (eds), *Philosophia Togata II. Plato and Aristotle at Rome*, Oxford 1997, pp. 70–85.
- Livingstone, N., *A Commentary on Isocrates’ Busiris*, Leiden-Boston-Köln 2001 (Mnemosyne suppl. 223).
- Lloyd, A.B., *Herodotus Book II. Commentary 1–98*, Leiden 1976 (21994) [EPRO 43].
- Lobeck, Ch.A., *Aglaophamus sive de theologiae mysticae Graecorum causis libri tres*, I–II, Regimontii Prussorum 1829 (reprint Darmstadt 1961).
- Loewenstamm, S.E., *Sanchuniaton*, RE Suppl. XIV, 1974, coll. 593–598.
- Long, A.A., *Stoic Readings of Homer*, in R. Lamberton, J. Keaney (eds), *Homer’s Ancient Readers. The Hermeneutics of Greek Epic’s Earliest Exegetes*, Princeton 1992, pp. 41–66, reprint in A.A. Long, *Stoic Studies*, Cambridge 1996, pp. 58–84.
- Long, A.A., D.N. Sedley, *The Hellenistic Philosophers*, I–II, Cambridge 1987.
- Long, Ch.R., *The Twelve Gods of Greece and Rome*, Leiden-New York 1987 (EPRO 107).
- Lotze, D., *Lysander und der peloponnesische Krieg*, Berlin 1964 (Abhandlungen der Sächsischen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Leipzig, Philol.-hist. Kl. 57, 1).
- Lovejoy, A.O., Boas, G., *Primitivism and Related Ideas in Antiquity*, Baltimore 1935 (A Documented History of Primitivism and Related Ideas 1) [reprint Baltimore-London 1997].
- Lüthi, M., *Drei, Dreizahl*, Enzyklopädie des Märchens III, 1981, coll. 851–868.
- Luppe, W., *Das Komikerglossar Pap. Oxy. 1801*, „Philologus“ 111, 1967, pp. 86–109.
- Luria, S., *Die Ersten werden die Letzten sein (Zur “sozialen Revolution” im Altertum)*, “Klio” 22, 1929, pp. 405–431.
- Ma, J., *Antiochus III and the Cities of Western Asia Minor*, Oxford 1999.
- Maass, E., *Aratea*, Berlin 1892 (PhU 12).
- Macdonald, M.C.A., *Trade Routes and Trade Goods at the Northern End of the “Incense Road” in the First Millennium B.C.*, in A. Avanzini (ed.), *Profumi d’Arabia (...)*, Roma 1997, pp. 333–349.
- MacGillivray, J.A., J.M. Driessen, L.H. Sackett (eds), *The Palaikastro Kouros. A Minoan Chryselephantine Statuette and its Aegean Bronze Age Context*, London 2000 (BSA. Studies 6).
- MacGillivray, J.A., L.H. Sackett, *The Palaikastro Kouros: the Cretan God as a Young Man*, in J.A. MacGillivray, J.M. Driessen, L.H. Sackett (eds), *The Palaikastro Kouros (...)*, pp. 165–169.
- Mackie, C.J., *Achilles in Fire*, CQ 48, 1998, pp. 329–338.
- Magno, P., *Quinto Ennio*, Fasano di Puglia 1979.
- , *Ennio nel De rustica di Varrone*, “Latomus” 65, 2006, pp. 75–82.
- Mahaffy, J.P., *The Flinders Petrie Papyri with Transcriptions, Commentaries and Indexes*, I, Dublin 1891.

- Malaise, M., *Le problème de hellénisation d'Isis*, in L. Bricault (éd.), *De Memphis à Rome. Actes du 1^{er} Colloque international sur les études isiaques, Poitiers-Futuroscope, 8–10 avril 1999*, Leiden-Boston-Köln 2000 (RGRW 140), pp. 3–19.
- Malkin, I., *Religion and Colonization in Ancient Greece*, Leiden 1987.
- , *Herakles and Melqart: Greeks and Phoenicians in the Middle Ground*, in E.S. Gruen (ed.), *Cultural Borrowings and Ethnic Appropriations in Antiquity*, Stuttgart 2005 (Oriens et Occidens 8), pp. 238–257.
- Mallwitz, A., *Olympia und seine Bauten*, München 1972.
- Manfredi, V., *Le Isole Fortunate. Topografia di un mito*, Roma 1996.
- Mansfeld, J., *Aspects of Epicurean Theology*, “Mnemosyne” 46, 1993, pp. 172–210.
- , *Theology*, in K. Algra et al. (eds), *The Cambridge History of Hellenistic Philosophy*, Cambridge 1999, pp. 452–478.
- Mansfeld, J., D.T. Runia, *Aëtiana. The Method and Intellectual Context of a Doxographer*, vol. I: *The Sources*, Leiden-New York-Köln 1997 (Philosophia Antiqua 73).
- Mansfeld, J., D.T. Runia, *Aëtiana. The Method and Intellectual Context of a Doxographer*, vol. II: *The Compendium*, Part 1–2, Leiden-Boston 2009 (Philosophia Antiqua 114).
- Mansfeld, J., D.T. Runia, *Aëtiana. The Method and Intellectual Context of a Doxographer*, vol. III: *Studies in the Doxographical Traditions of Ancient Philosophy*, Leiden-Boston 2010 (Philosophia Antiqua 118).
- Manuel, F.E., *The Eighteenth Century Confronts the Gods*, Cambridge, Mass. 1959.
- Marastoni, A., *Studio critico su Ennio minore*, “Aevum” 35, 1961, pp. 1–27.
- Marcovich, M., *Hermocles' Ithyphallus for Demetrius*, in idem, *Studies in Graeco-Roman Religions and Gnosticism*, Leiden 1988, pp. 8–19.
- Mari, M., *Il 'culto della personalità' a Samo, tra Lisandro e Demetrio Poliorcete*, in E. Cavallini (ed.), *Samo. Storia, letteratura, scienza*, Pisa-Roma 2004 (AION. Sezione filologico-letteraria. Quaderni 8), pp. 177–196.
- Marinatos, N., *What Were Greek Sanctuaries? A Synthesis*, in N. Marinatos, R. Hägg (eds), *Greek Sanctuaries. New Approaches*, London-New York 1993, pp. 228–233.
- , *The Goddess and the Warrior. The Naked Goddess and Mistress of Animals in Early Greek Religion*, London-New York 2000.
- Marinatos, S., *Die Wanderung des Zeus*, AA 1962, pp. 903–916.
- Marincola, J., *Authority and Tradition in Ancient Historiography*, Cambridge 1997.
- , *Genre, Convention, and Innovation in Greco-Roman Historiography*, in C.S. Kraus (ed.), *The Limits of Historiography. Genre and Narrative in Ancient Historical Texts*, Leiden-Boston-Köln 1999 (Mnemosyne suppl. 191), pp. 281–324.
- Mariotti, S., *Ennius*, KP II, 1967, coll. 270–276.
- Martin, K., *Stele*, Lex. Ägypt. VI, 1986, coll. 1–6.
- Martin, R., H. Metzger, *La religion grecque*, Paris 1992.
- Martinetz, D., K. Lohs, J. Janzen, *Weihrauch und Myrrhe. Kulturgeschichte und wirtschaftliche Bedeutung. Botanik, Chemie, Medizin*, Stuttgart 1989.
- Maul, S.M., *Altorientalische Tatenberichte mit (auto)biographischen Zügen*, in *La Biographie antique*, Vandoeuvres-Genève 1998 (Entretiens sur l'antiquité classique 44), pp. 7–25.
- Mayor, J.B., *Cicero, De natura deorum*, III, Cambridge 1885.
- McKenzie, J., *Glimpsing Alexandria from Archaeological Evidence*, JRA 16, 2003, pp. 35–61, esp. pp. 50–56 (“The Temple of Serapis”).
- McKenzie, J., Sh. Gibson, A.T. Reys, *Reconstructing the Serapeum in Alexandria from the Archaeological Evidence*, JRS 94, 2004, pp. 73–121.
- McLaughlin, R., *Rome and the Distant East. Trade Routes to the Ancient Lands of Arabia, India and China*, London-New York 2010, esp. pp. 61–81, 194–200 (“Rome and the Arabian Trade Routes”).
- McLennan, G.R., *Callimachus, Hymn to Zeus. Introduction and Commentary*, Roma 1977 (Testi e commenti 2).

- Meer, H.F. van der, *Euhemerus van Messene*, Diss. Amsterdam 1949.
- Mehrlin, R., *Dreiheit*, RAC IV, 1959, coll. 269–310.
- Meier, Ch., *Ein antiker Äquivalent des Fortschrittsgedankens: Das "Könnens-Bewusstsein" des 5. Jahrhunderts v. Chr.*, in *idem*, *Die Entstehung des Politischen bei den Griechen*, Frankfurt a. M. ³1995, pp. 435–499.
- Meier, M., *Aristokraten und Damaden. Untersuchungen zur inneren Entwicklung Spartas im 7. Jahrhundert v. Chr. und zur politischen Funktion der Dichtung des Tyrtaios*, Stuttgart 1998.
- Meijer, P.A., *Philosophers, Intellectuals and Religion in Hellas*, in H.S. Versnel, (ed.), *Faith, Hope and Worship. Aspects of Religious Mentality in the Ancient World*, Leiden 1981 (Studies in Greek and Roman Religion 2), pp. 216–263.
- Meillier, C., *Callimaque et son temps. Recherches sur la carrière et la condition d'un écrivain à l'époque des premiers Lagides*, Diss. Paris 1975, Lille 1979.
- Meincke, W., *Untersuchungen zu den Enkomiaistischen Gedichten Theokrits. Ein Beitrag zum Verständnis hellenistischer Dichtung und des antiken Herrscherenkommions*, Diss. Kiel 1966.
- Meissner, B., *Historiker zwischen Polis und Königshof. Studien zu Stellung der Geschichtsschreiber in der griechischen Gesellschaft in spätklassischer und frühhellenistischer Zeit*, Göttingen 1992 (Hypomnemata 99).
- , *Hofmann und Herrscher. Was es für die Griechen hiess, Freund eines Königs zu sein*, „Archiv für Kulturgeschichte“ 82, 2000, pp. 1–36.
- Meister, K., *Historische Kritik bei Polybios*, Wiesbaden 1975 (Palingenesia 9).
- , *Diodoros*, DNP III, 1997, coll. 592–594.
- Mejer, J., *Diogenes Laertius and His Hellenistic Background*, Wiesbaden 1978 (Hermes Einzelschriften 40).
- Merkel, H., *Sibyllinen*, Gütersloh 1998 (Jüdische Schriften aus hellenistisch-römischer Zeit, V 8), pp. 1042–1140.
- Merkelbach, R., *Mithras. Ein persisch-römischer Mysterienkult*, Weinheim ²1994.
- , *Isis Regina – Zeus Sarapis. Die griechisch-ägyptische Religion nach den Quellen dargestellt*, Stuttgart-Leipzig 1995 (²2001).
- Mette, H.J., *Euripides*, „Lustrum“ 19, 1976 [1978], esp. pp. 67–70 („Sisyphos“).
- , *Euripides*, „Lustrum“ 23/24, 1981/1982, esp. pp. 238–241 („Sisyphos“).
- Meursius, J., *Criticus Arnobianus tributis in libros septem*, Leiden 1598.
- Mewaldt, J., *Die Überlieferung über den Euhemerus des Ennius*, in *Verhandlungen der 51. Versammlung Deutscher Philologen und Schulmänner in Posen vom 3. bis 6. Oktober 1911*. Im Auftrage des Ausschusses zusammengestellt von P. Symank, Leipzig 1912, pp. 42–43.
- Meyer, E., *Homerische Parerga*, „Hermes“ 27, 1892, pp. 363–380.
- Meyer, E., *Untersuchungen zur Geschichte des zweiten punischen Krieges, VII: Ursprung und Entwicklung der Überlieferung über die Persönlichkeit des Scipio Africanus und die Eroberung von Neukarthago*, in *idem*, *Kleine Schriften*, II, Halle 1924, pp. 423–457.
- Michaelis, W., *De origine indicis deorum cognominum*, Diss. Berlin 1898.
- Mikalson, J., *Religion in Hellenistic Athens*, Berkeley-Los Angeles-London 1998 (Hellenistic Culture and Society 29).
- Miller, J.I., *The Spice Trade of the Roman Empire 29 B.C. to A.D. 641*, Oxford 1969.
- Miller, S.G., *The Philippeion and Macedonian Hellenistic Architecture*, MDAI (A) 88, 1973, pp. 189–218.
- Minar, E.L., *Pythagorean Communism*, TAPhA 75, 1944, pp. 34–46.
- Misch, G., *Geschichte der Autobiographie*. Dritte stark vermehrte Auflage, I 1, Frankfurt a. M. 1949.
- Mischkowski, H., *Die heiligen Tische im Götterkultus der Griechen und Römer*, Diss. Königsberg 1917.
- Mitchell, H., *Sparta*, Cambridge 1964.

- Möllendorff, P. von, *Auf der Suche nach der verlogenen Wahrheit. Lukians "Wahre Geschichten"*, Tübingen 2000 (Classica Monacensia 21).
- Molter, T., „Glückliche Inseln“ antiker und mittelalterlicher Entdeckungsreisen im nordwesteuropäisch-atlantischen Raum, „Jahrbuch der Wittheit zu Bremen“ 18, 1974, pp. 315–325.
- Momigliano, A., *Filippo il Macedone. Saggio sulla storia greca del IV secolo a.C.*, Milano 1934 (²1987).
- , *How Roman Emperors Became Gods*, in *idem*, *On Pagans, Jews, and Christians*, Middletown, Conn. 1987, pp. 92–107.
- Mommsen, Th., *Der Rechenchaftsbericht des Augustus*, HZ 57, 1887, pp. 385–397, reprint in *idem*, *Gesammelte Schriften*, IV 1: *Historische Schriften*, Berlin 1906, pp. 247–258.
- Montano, A., *La genesi della credenza religiosa secondo Democrito*, „Elenchos“ 5, 1984, pp. 365–390.
- Moore, C.H., *Julius Firmicus Maternus, der Heide und der Christ*, Diss. München 1897.
- Mora, F., *Arnobio e culti di mistero. Analisi storico-religiosa del V libro dell'Adversus Nationes*, Roma 1994 (Storia delle Religioni 10).
- Morgan, J.R., *Lucian's True Histories and the Wonders beyond Thule of Antonius Diogenes*, CQ 35, 1985, pp. 475–490.
- , *Fiction and History: Historiography and the Novel*, in J. Marincola (ed.), *A Companion to Greek and Roman Historiography*, Malden, Mass.-Oxford-Chichester 2011 (¹2007) (Blackwell Companions to the Ancient World), pp. 553–564.
- Morrow, G.R., *Plato's Law of Slavery in its Relation to Greek Law*, Urbana 1939 (Illinois Studies in Language and Literature XXV 3) [reprint Buffalo 2002].
- Mossé, C., *Un aspect de la crise de la cité grecque au IV^e siècle. Le recrudescence de la tyrannie*, „Revue philosophique“ 87, 1962, pp. 1–20.
- Most, G.W., *Cornutus and Stoic Allegoresis: A Preliminary Report*, ANRW II 36, 3, 1989, pp. 2014–2065.
- Mras, K., *Sanchuniaton*, Anzeiger der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, Phil.-hist. Kl. 89, 1952, pp. 175–186.
- Muccioli, F., *I Siracusani, Dione e l'Herrscherkult*, „Simblos“ 2, 1997, pp. 107–133.
- , *Dionisio II. Storia e tradizione letteraria*, Bologna 1999 (Monografie di Simblos 1), esp. pp. 471–481 (‘Dionisio II e il culto del sovrano’).
- , *Un medico che si credeva Zeus: Menecrate di Siracusa. Osservazioni su un caso di Gottmenschentum nel IV secolo A.C.*, „Rivista di Storia della Medicina“ 31 (NS 10), 2000, pp. 403–413.
- , *Il culto del sovrano di epoca ellenistica e i suoi prodomi. Tre casi paradigmatici: Ierone I, Lisandro, la tirannide di Eraclea Pontica*, in *Politiche religiose nel mondo antico e tardoantico. Poteri e indirizzi, forme del controllo, idee e prassi di tolleranza*. Atti del Convegno internazionale di studi (Firenze, 24–26 settembre 2009), a cura di G.A. Cecconi, Ch. Gabrielli, Bari 2011, pp. 97–132.
- Müller, D., *Ägypten und die griechischen Isis-Aretalogien*, Berlin 1961 (Abhandlungen der Sächsischen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Leipzig, Philol.-hist. Kl. 53, 1).
- Müller, K., *Allegorische Dichtererklärung*, RE Suppl. IV, 1924, coll. 16–22.
- Müller, K.E., *Geschichte der antiken Ethnographie und ethnologischen Theoriebildung von den Anfängen bis auf die byzantinischen Historiographen*, I, Wiesbaden 1972 (Studien zur Kulturkunde 29).
- Müller, L., *Q. Enni Carminum reliquiae. Accedunt Cn. Naevi Belli Poenici quae supersunt. Emendavit et adnotavit*, Petropoli 1884.
- , *Quintus Ennius. Eine Einleitung in das Studium der römischen Poesie*, St. Petersburg 1884.
- Müller, R., *Zur sozialen Utopie im Hellenismus*, in *Die Rolle der Volksmassen in der Geschichte der vorkapitalistischen Gesellschaftsformationen*, hrsg. von J. Herrmann und I. Sellnow, Berlin 1975 (Veröffentlichungen des Zentralinstituts für Alte Geschichte

- und Archäologie der Akademie der Wissenschaften der DDR 7), pp. 277–286, reprint in *idem*, *Menschenbild und Humanismus der Antike. Studien zur Geschichte der Literatur und Philosophie*, Leipzig 1980, pp. 189–201.
- , *Die Entdeckung der Kultur. Antike Theorien über Ursprung und Entwicklung der Kultur von Homer bis Seneca*, Düsseldorf-Zürich 2003.
- Müller, R.J., *Überlegungen zur IEPANAΓPAΦH des Euhemerios von Messene*, „Hermes“ 121, 1993, pp. 276–300.
- Müller, S., *Das hellenistische Königspaar in der medialen Repräsentation. Ptolemaios II und Arsinoe II*, Berlin-New York 2009 (Beiträge zur Altertumskunde 263).
- , *Onesikritos und das Achaimenidenreich*, „Anabasis“ 2, 2011, pp. 45–66.
- Müller, W.W., *Weihrauch*, RE Suppl. XV, 1978, col. 700–777.
- Münzer, F., *Beiträge zur Quellenkritik der Naturgeschichte des Plinius*, Berlin 1897.
- Mullach, F.G.A., *Fragmenta Philosophorum Graecorum*, II, Parisiis 1867 (reprint Aalen 1868).
- Murray, O., *Hecataeus of Abdera and Pharaonic Kingship*, JEA 56, 1970, pp. 141–171.
- , *The Date of Hecataeus' Work on Egypt*, in M. Stern, O. Murray, *Hecataeus of Abdera and Theophrastus on Jews and Egyptians*, JEA 59, 1973, pp. 163–168.
- Muth, R., *Einführung in die griechische und römische Religion*, Darmstadt ²1998.
- Mylonopoulos, J., *Divine Images versus Cult Images. An Endless Story about Theories, Methods, and Terminologies*, in *idem* (ed.), *Divine Images and Human Imaginations in Ancient Greece and Rome*, Leiden-Boston 2010 (RGRW 170), pp. 1–19.
- Nailis, Ch., *Aurelius Augustinus en Euhemerus*, „Philologische Studien“ 11/12, 1939/1941, 81–89.
- Nautin, P., *Sanchuniathon chez Philon de Byblos et chez Porphyre*, „Revue Biblique“ 56, 1949, pp. 259–273.
- Némethy, G., *Euhemeri reliquiae. Collegit, prolegomenis et adnotationibus instruxit*, Budapest 1889.
- , *De vestigiis doctrinae Euhemereae in Oraculis Sibyllinis*, „Egyetemes Philologiai Közlöny“ 21, 1897, pp. 1–6.
- , *Quaestiunculae Euhemereae*, „Egyetemes Philologiai Közlöny“ 24, 1900, pp. 125–128.
- Nenci, G., *Il motivo dell'autopsia nella storiografia greca*, SCO 3, 1953 [1955], pp. 14–46.
- Nesselrath, H.-G., *Utopie-Parodie in Lukians Wahren Geschichten*, in W. Ax, R.F. Glei (Hgg.), *Literaturparodie in Antike und Mittelalter*, Trier 1993 (BAC 15), pp. 41–56.
- , *Platon und die Erfindung von Atlantis*, München-Leipzig 2002 (Lectio Teubneriana 11).
- , *Platon, Kritias. Übersetzung und Kommentar*, Göttingen 2006 (Platon, Werke, Bd. VIII 4).
- Nestle, W., *Bemerkungen zu den Vorsokratikern und Sophisten*, „Philologus“ 67, 1908, pp. 531–581.
- , *Die Horen des Prodikos*, „Hermes“ 71, 1936, pp. 151–170, reprint in *idem*, *Griechische Studien. Untersuchungen zur Religion, Dichtung und Philosophie der Griechen*, Stuttgart 1948 (reprint Aalen 1968), pp. 403–429 and in C.J. Classen (Hrsg.), *Sophistik*, Darmstadt 1976 (WdF 187), pp. 425–451.
- , *Vom Mythos zum Logos. Die Selbstentfaltung des griechischen Denkens von Homer bis auf Sophistik und Sokrates*, Stuttgart ²1942 (reprint Aalen 1966 and Stuttgart 1975).
- , *Griechische Geistesgeschichte von Homer bis Lukian in ihrer Entfaltung vom mythischen zum rationalen Denken dargestellt*, Stuttgart ²1956.
- Nicklin, T., *Epimenides' Minos*, CR 30, 1916, pp. 33–37.
- Niebergall, V., *Griechische Religion und Mythologie in der ältesten Literatur der Römer*, Diss. Gießen 1937.
- Niese, B., *Dionysius I*, RE V 1, 1903, coll. 882–903.
- , *Herodot-Studien besonders zur spartanischen Geschichte*, „Hermes“ 42, 1907, pp. 419–468.

- Nietzsche, F., *Der Florentinische Tractat über Homer und Hesiod, ihr Geschlecht und ihren Wettkampf*, RhM 25, 1870, pp. 528–540 and 28, 1873, pp. 211–249.
- Nikiprowetzky, V., *La troisième Sibylle*, Paris-La Haye 1970 (École Pratique des Hautes Études, 6^{me} sect., Études Juives 9).
- , *La Sibylle juive et le „Troisième Livre“ des „Pseudo-Oracles Sibyllins“ depuis Charles Alexandre*, ANRW II 20, 1, 1987, pp. 460–542.
- Nilsson, M.P., *Griechische Feste von religiöser Bedeutung mit Ausschluss der Attischen*. Zweite Auflage. Neudruck der Erstauflage (1906) mit einer Einführung von F. Graf, Stuttgart-Leipzig 1995.
- , *Die Grundlagen des spartanischen Lebens*, „Klio“ 12, 1912, pp. 308–340, reprint in K. Christ (Hrsg.), *Sparta* 1986 (WdF 622), pp. 104–143.
- , *Der Flammentod des Herakles auf dem Oite*, ARW 21, 1922, pp. 310–316, reprint in *idem*, *Opuscula selecta*, I, Lund 1951, pp. 348–354.
- , *The Origin of Belief among the Greeks in the Divinity of the Heavenly Bodies*, HThR 33, 1940, pp. 1–8, reprint in *idem*, *Opuscula selecta ad historiam religionis Graecae*, III, Lund 1960, pp. 31–39.
- , *The Minoan-Mycenaean Religion and its Survival in Greek Religion*, Lund ²1950 (Acta Reg. Societatis Humaniorum Lundensis) [reprint Lund 1968].
- , *Geschichte der griechischen Religion*, I–II, München ⁴1988 (HdA V 2).
- Ninck, M., *Die Bedeutung des Wassers im Kult und Leben der Alten. Eine symbolgeschichtliche Untersuchung*, Leipzig 1921 (Philologus Supplbd. XIV 2) [reprint Darmstadt 1960].
- Nippel, W., *Mischverfassungstheorie und Verfassungsrealität in Antike und früher Neuzeit*, Stuttgart 1980 (Geschichte und Gesellschaft. Bochumer Historische Studien 21).
- Nock, A.D., *Notes on Ruler Cult I–IV*, JHS 48, 1928, pp. 21–43, reprint in *idem*, *Essays* (...), I, pp. 134–159.
- , ΣΥΝΝΑΟΣ ΘΕΟΣ, HSCPh 41, 1930, pp. 1–62, reprint in *idem*, *Essays* (...), I, pp. 202–251.
- , rev. W. Otto, H. Bengtson, *Zur Geschichte des Niederganges des Ptolemäerreiches*, München 1938, AJPh 63, 1942, pp. 217–224, reprint in *idem*, *Essays* (...), II, pp. 551–558.
- , rev. Harder, „Gnomon“ 21, 1949, pp. 221–229, reprint in *idem*, *Essays* (...), II, pp. 703–711.
- , *Soter and Euergetes* [1951], reprint in *idem*, *Essays* (...), II, pp. 720–735.
- , *Essays on Religion and the Ancient World*. Selected and Edited, with an Introduction, Bibliography of Nock's writings, and Indexes, by Z. Stewart, I–II, Oxford 1972 (reprint Oxford 1986).
- Norden, E., *Agnostos Theos. Untersuchungen zur Formengeschichte religiöser Rede*, Leipzig-Berlin 1913 (reprint Darmstadt ⁶1974).
- , *Ennius und Vergilius. Kriegsbilder aus Roms großer Zeit*, Leipzig-Berlin 1915.
- , *Die germanische Urgeschichte in Tacitus Germania*. Dritter Abdruck mit Ergänzungen, Leipzig-Berlin 1923.
- Novara, A., *Les idées romaines sur le progrès d'après les écrivains de la République (essai sur le sens latin du progrès)*, Paris 1982 (Collection d'Études Anciennes. Publications de la Sorbonne. Histoire ancienne et médiévale 9–10).
- Nuffelen, P. van, *Le culte des souverains hellénistiques, le gui de la religion grecque*, AncSoc 29, 1998/1999, pp. 175–189.
- , *Le culte royal de l'empire des Séleucides: une réinterprétation*, „Historia“ 53, 2004, pp. 278–301.
- Obbink, D., *Philodemus, On Piety Part I. Critical Text with Commentary*, Oxford 1996.
- O'Brien, M.J., *Xenophanes, Aeschylus, and the Doctrine of Primeval Brutishness*, CQ 35, 1985, pp. 264–277.
- Oden, R.A., *Philo of Byblos and Hellenistic Historiography*, „Palestine Exploration Quarterly“ 110, 1978, pp. 115–126.

- Oertel, F., *Die soziale Frage im Altertum*, NJWJ 3, 1927, pp. 1–18.
- Ogilvie, R.M., *The Library of Lactantius*, Oxford 1978.
- Opelt, I., *Die Polemik in der christlichen lateinischen Literatur von Tertullian bis Augustin*, Heidelberg 1980 (Bibliothek der klassischen Altertumswissenschaft NF 2. Reihe, Bd. 63).
- Orth, W., *Königlicher Machtanspruch und städtische Freiheit. Untersuchungen zu den politischen Beziehungen zwischen den ersten Seleukidenherrschern (Seleukos I., Antiochos I., Antiochos II.) und den Städten des westlichen Kleinasien*, München 1977 (Münchener Beiträge zur Papyrusforschung und antiken Rechtsgeschichte 71).
- Osmun, G.F., *Palaephatus – Pragmatic Mythographer*, CJ 52, 1956, pp. 131–137.
- Østby, E., *Der Ursprung der griechischen Tempelarchitektur und ihre Beziehungen mit Ägypten*, in M. Bietak (Hrsg.), *Archaische griechische Tempel und Altägypten*, Wien 2001, pp. 17–33.
- Otto, B., *Zeus Kretagenes*, in P. Åström, D. Sörenhagen (Hgg.), *Periplus. Festschrift für H.-G. Buchholz zu seinem achtzigsten Geburtstag am 24. Dezember 1999*, Jonsöred 2000 (Studies in Mediterranean Archaeology 127), pp. 135–141.
- Otto, W., *Priester und Tempel im hellenistischen Ägypten. Ein Beitrag zur Kulturgeschichte des Hellenismus*, I-II, Leipzig-Berlin 1905–1908.
- , *Beiträge zur Seleukidengeschichte des 3. Jahrhunderts v. Chr.*, München 1928 (Abhandlungen der Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, Philosophisch-philologische und historische Klasse 34, 1).
- Otto, W., H. Bengtson, *Zur Geschichte des Niedergangs des Ptolemäerreiches*, München 1938 (Abhandlungen der Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, Phil.-hist. Abt., NF 17, 1938).
- Paassen, Ch. van, *The Classical Tradition of Geography*, Diss. Utrecht, Groningen-Djakarta 1957.
- Pace, B., *Arte e civiltà della Sicilia antica*, II, Milano-Genova-Roma-Napoli 1938.
- Palm, J., *Über Sprache und Stil des Diodoros von Sizilien. Ein Beitrag zur Beleuchtung der hellenistischen Prosa*, Lund 1955.
- Pape, W., G.E. Benseler, *Wörterbuch der griechischen Eigennamen*, I-II, Braunschweig 1863–1870.
- Parke, H.W., *Sibyls and Sibylline Prophecy in Classical Antiquity*, London-New York 1988.
- Parker, G., *The Making of Roman India*, Cambridge 2008.
- Parker, R., *Athenian Religion. A History*, Oxford 1996.
- , *Miasma. Pollution and Purification in Early Greek Religion*, Oxford 1996 (1983).
- , *ὥς ἦτοι ἐν᾿αγίειν*, in R. Hägg, B. Alroth (eds), *Greek Sacrificial Ritual, Olympian and Chthonian. Proceedings of the Sixth International Seminar on Ancient Greek Cult, organized by the Department of Classical Archaeology and Ancient History, Göteborg University, 25–27 April 1997*, Stockholm 2005 (Acta Instituti Atheniensis Regni Sueciae, series in 8°, 18), pp. 37–45.
- , *On Greek Religion*, Ithaca-London 2011 (Townsend Lectures. Cornell Studies in Classical Philology 60).
- Pascal, C., *Lo Scipio di Ennio*, “Athenaeum” 3, 1915, pp. 369–395, reprint in, *idem, Scritti varii di letteratura latina*, Torino 1920, pp. 3–26.
- Pasquali, G., *Per la delimitazione di un frammento dell’“Euemero” di Ennio*, RFIC 37, 1909, pp. 38–53.
- Pastorino, A., *Iuli Firmici Materni De errore profanarum religionum. Introduzione e commento*, Firenze 1956 (Biblioteca di Studi Superiori 27) [reprint 1969].
- Pearson, L., *The Lost Histories of Alexander the Great*, New York 1960 (American Philological Association. Philological Monographs 20) [reprint Chico, Calif. 1983].
- Pease, A.S., *Some Aspects of Invisibility*, HSCPh 53, 1942, pp. 1–36.
- , *M. Tulli Ciceronis De natura deorum l. I-III*, Cambridge, Mass. 1955–1968 (reprint Darmstadt 1968).
- Pechstein, N., *Euripides Satyrographos. Ein Kommentar zu den Euripideischen Satyrspielfragmenten*, Stuttgart-Leipzig 1998 (Beiträge zur Altertumskunde 115).

- Pédech, P., *Les idées religieuses de Polybe: Étude sur la religion de l'élite gréco-romaine au II^e siècle av. J.-C.*, RHR 167, 1965, pp. 35–68.
- , *Historiens compagnons d'Alexandre. Callisthène-Onésicrite-Néarque-Ptolémée-Aristobule*, Paris 1984.
- Peek, W., *Der Isishymnos von Andros und verwandte Texte*, Berlin 1930.
- Pépin, J., *Mythe et allégorie. Les origines grecques et les contestations judéo-chrétiennes*. Nouvelle édition, revue et augmentée, Paris ²1976.
- , *Christianisme et mythologie. L'evhémérisme des auteurs chrétiens*, in Y. Bonnefoy, (éd.), *Dictionnaire des mythologies et des religions des sociétés traditionnelles et du monde antique*, I, Paris 1981, pp. 175–181, reprint in *idem*, *De la philosophie ancienne à la théologie patristique*, London 1986, pp. 1–16.
- Peretti, A., *La Sibilla babilonese nella propaganda ellenistica*, Firenze 1943 (Biblioteca di cultura 21).
- Perlman, P., *Imagining Crete*, in M.H. Hansen (ed.), *The Imaginary Polis. Symposium, January 7–10, 2004*, Copenhagen 2005 (Acts of the Copenhagen Polis Centre 7), pp. 282–334.
- Perpillou-Thomas, F., *Fêtes d'Égypte Ptolémaïque et Romaine d'après la documentation papyrologique grecque*, Lovanii 1993 (Studia Hellenistica 31).
- Petermann, F.H.A., *Über die Satire des Ennius. Zweiter Teil. Ueber den Scipio, den Epicharmus, die Hedypatheia, den Sota, den Protrepicus und die Präcepta des Ennius*, Hirschberg 1852 (Programm des Gymnasiums zu Hirschberg. Ostern 1852), pp. 1–20, esp. pp. 1–8 („Der Scipio“).
- Pfeiffer, R., *Arsinoe Philadelphos in der Dichtung*, „Die Antike“ 2, 1926, pp. 161–174.
- , *Callimachus*, I-II, Oxonii 1949–1953 (reprint Oxford 1965).
- , *History of Classical Scholarship from the Beginning to the End of the Hellenistic Age*, Oxford 1968.
- Pfeiffer, St., *The God Serapis, His Cult and the Beginnings of the Ruler Cult in Ptolemaic Egypt*, in P. McKechnie, Ph. Guillaume (eds), *Ptolemy II Philadelphus and His World*, Leiden-Boston 2008 (Mnemosyne suppl. 300), pp. 387–408.
- , *Herrscher- und Dynastiekulte im Ptolemäerreich. Systematik und Einordnung der Kultformen*, München 2008 (Münchener Beiträge zur Papyrusforschung und antiken Rechtsgeschichte 98).
- Pfister, F., *Der Reliquienkult im Altertum*, I-II, Gießen 1909–1912 (RGVV Bd. V 1–2) (reprint Berlin-New York 1974).
- , *Die Religion der Griechen und Römer*, Leipzig 1930 (JAW Supplbd. 229).
- , *Ein apokrypher Alexanderbrief. Der sogenannte Leon von Pella und die Kirchenväter*, in *Mullus. Festschrift Th. Klauser*, Münster 1964 (JbAC Ergbd. 1), pp. 291–297, reprint in *idem*, *Kleine Schriften zum Alexanderroman*, Meisenheim am Glan 1976 (Beiträge zur klassischen Philologie 61), pp. 104–111.
- Pfligersdorffer, G., *Studien zu Poseidonios*, Wien 1959 (SÖAW, Phil.-hist. Kl. CCXXXII 5).
- Philip, J.A., *Pythagoras and Early Pythagoreanism*, Toronto 1966 (Phoenix suppl. 7).
- Piérart, M., *La mort de Dionysos à Argos*, in R. Hägg (ed.), *The Role of Religion in the Early Greek Polis. Proceedings of the Third International Seminar on Ancient Greek Cult, Organized by the Swedish Institute at Athens, 16–18 October 1992*, Stockholm 1996 (Acta Instituti Atheniensis Regni Sueciae, series in 8°, 14), pp. 141–151.
- , *Le tombeau de Dionysos à Delphes*, in *Ποικίλα. Hommage à O. Scholer*, Luxembourg 1996 (Études classiques 8), pp. 137–154.
- Pietrzykowski, M., *Rzeźby greckie z Sarapeum memfickiego. Studium ikonograficzne*, Warszawa 1976.
- Plaumann, G., *Probleme des alexandrinischen Alexanderkultes*, APF 6, 1920, pp. 77–99.
- Pöhlmann, R. von, *Geschichte der sozialen Frage und des Sozialismus in der antiken Welt*, 3. Auflage durchgesehen und um einen Anhang vermehrt von F. Oertel, I–II, München ³1925 (reprint Darmstadt 1984).

- Poerner, I., *De Curetibus et Corybantibus*, Dissertationes philologicae Hallenses XXII 2, 1913.
- Pötscher, W., *ΘΕΟΣ. Studien zur älteren griechischen Gottesvorstellung*, Diss. Wien 1953 (typescript).
- , *Das Person-Bereichdenken in der frühgriechischen Periode*, WSt 72, 1959, pp. 5–25, reprint in *idem, Hellas und Rom (...)*, pp. 49–69.
- , *Person-Bereichdenken und Personifikation*, „Literaturwissenschaftliches Jahrbuch“ NF 19, 1978, pp. 217–231, reprint in *idem, Hellas und Rom (...)*, pp. 70–89.
- , *Hellas und Rom. Beiträge und kritische Auseinandersetzung mit der inzwischen erschienen Literatur*, Hildesheim-Zürich-New York 1988 (Collectanea 21).
- Pohlenz, M., *Die Stoa. Geschichte einer geistigen Bewegung*, I-II, Göttingen 1948–1949 (51980).
- , *Paulus und die Stoa*, ZNW 42, 1949, pp. 69–104.
- Polet, A., *Deux utopies hellénistiques: La Panchaie d'Évhémère et la Cité du Soleil de Jambule*, Bulletin of the Faculty of Arts, Fouad I University, vol. IX 1, 1947, pp. 47–62.
- Postlethwaite, N., *The Death of Zeus Kretagenes*, „Kernos“ 12, 1999, pp. 85–98.
- Potter, D., *Sibyls in the Greek and Roman World*, JRA 3, 1990, pp. 471–483.
- Powell, I.U., *On the Alleged New Fragment of Epimenides*, CR 30, 1916, pp. 139–142.
- , *Collectanea Alexandrina. Reliquiae minores Poetarum Graecorum Aetatis Ptolemaicae 323–146 A.C. (...)*, Oxonii 1925 (reprint Oxonii 1970).
- Praechter, K., *Die Philosophie des Altertums*. Zwölfte, umgearbeitete und erweiterte Auflage, Berlin 121926.
- Préaux, C., *L'image du roi de l'époque hellénistique*, in *Images of Man in Ancient and Medieval Thought. Studia G. Verbeke ab amicis et collegis dicata*, Leuven 1976, pp. 53–75.
- , *Le monde hellénistique*, Paris 1978.
- Preller, L., *Ausgewählte Aufsätze aus dem Gebiete der classischen Alterthumswissenschaft*, hrsg. von R. Köhler, Berlin 1864, pp. 312–329 („Mnaseas von Patara“).
- Prent, M., *Cretan Sanctuaries and Cults. Continuity and Change from Late Minoan III C to the Archaic Period*, Leiden-Boston 2005 (RGRW 154).
- Prestianni Giallombardo, A.M., *ΦΙΛΙΠΠΙΚΑ*, I: *Sul „culto“ di Filippo II di Macedonia*, „Siculorum Gymnasium“ 28, 1975, pp. 1–57.
- Price, S.R.F., *Between Man and God: Sacrifice in the Roman Imperial Cult*, JRS 70, 1980, pp. 28–43.
- , *Gods and Emperors: The Greek Language of the Roman Imperial Cult*, JHS 104, 1984, pp. 79–95.
- , *Rituals and Power. The Roman Imperial Cult in Asia Minor*, Cambridge 1984.
- Prontera, F., *Insel*, RAC XVIII, 1998, coll. 312–328.
- Puelma Piwonka, M., *Lucilius und Kallimachos. Zur Geschichte einer Gattung der hellenistischen Poesie*, Diss. Zürich 1947, Frankfurt a.M 1949.
- Rackham, H., *Cicero, De natura deorum. Academica. With an English Translation*, London-Cambridge, Mass. 1951(1931) [LCL 268].
- Ramage, E.S., *The Nature and Purpose of Augustus' "Res gestae"*, Stuttgart 1987 (Historia Einzelschriften 54).
- Rapisarda, E., *Clemente fonte di Arnobio*, Torino 1939.
- Rathjens, C., *Kulturelle Einflüsse in Südwest-Arabien von den ältesten Zeiten bis zum Islam, unter besonderer Berücksichtigung des Hellenismus*, „Jahrbuch für Kleinasiatische Forschung“ 1, 1950/1951, pp. 1–42.
- Reardon, B.P., *The Form of Greek Romance*, Princeton 1991.
- Rees, B.R., *Callimachus, Iambus I 9–11*, CR 75, 1961, pp. 1–3.
- Reeve, C.D.C., *Philosopher-Kings. The Argument of Plato's Republic*, Princeton 1988.
- Reinach, Th., *Le collectivisme des Grecs de Lipari*, REG 3, 1890, pp. 86–96.
- Reinhardt, K., *De Graecorum theologia capita duo*, Diss. Berlin 1910.

- , *Hekataios von Abdera und Demokrit*, "Hermes" 47, 1912, pp. 492–513, reprint in *idem, Vermächtnis der Antike. Gesammelte Essays zur Philosophie und Geschichtsschreibung*, Göttingen ²1966, pp. 114–132.
- Reinhardt, L., *Die Quellen von Ciceros Schrift De natura deorum*, Diss. Breslau 1888 (Breslauer Philologische Abhandlungen III 2).
- Reitzenstein, R., *Zwei religionsgeschichtliche Fragen nach ungedruckten griechischen Texten der Straßburger Bibliothek*, Straßburg 1901.
- , *Poimandres. Studien zur griechisch-ägyptischen und frühchristlichen Literatur*, Leipzig 1904 (reprint Stuttgart 1969).
- , *Hellenistische Wundererzählungen*, Leipzig 1906 (reprint Stuttgart 1963).
- Reyh, K., *Antonius Diogenes. Untersuchungen zu den Romanfragmenten der „Wunder jenseits von Thule“ und zu den „Wahren Geschichten“ Lukians*, Diss. Tübingen 1969.
- Ribbeck, O., *Geschichte der römischen Dichtung*, I, Stuttgart ²1894.
- Ribichini, S., *Taautos et l'invention de l'écriture chez Philon de Byblos*, in *Phoinikeia Grammata. Lire et écrire en Méditerranée. Actes du Colloque de Liège*, 15–18 novembre 1989, édités par Cl. Braurain, C. Bonnet, V. Krings, Namur 1991 (Collections d'Études Classiques 6), pp. 201–213.
- Rice, E.E., *The Grand Procession of Ptolemy Philadelphus*, Oxford 1993.
- Richardson, N.J., *The Homeric Hymn to Demeter*, Oxford 1974.
- , *Homeric Professors in the Age of the Sophists*, PCPhS 21, 1975, pp. 65–81.
- , *The Contest of Homer and Hesiod and Alcidas' Mouseion*, CQ 75, 1981, pp. 1–10.
- Richter, W., *Staat, Gesellschaft und Dichtung in Rom im 3. und 2. Jahrhundert v. Chr.*, „Gymnasium“ 69, 1962, pp. 286–310.
- Riedweg, Ch., *Pythagoras. Leben, Lehre, Nachwirkung. Eine Einführung*, München 2002.
- Riese, A., *Die communis historia des Lutatius*, RhM 18, 1863, pp. 448–450.
- , *Die Idealisierung [sic] der Naturvölker des Nordens in der griechischen und römischen Literatur*, Frankfurt a.M. 1875 (Programm des städtischen Gymnasiums zu Frankfurt a.M. 1875), pp. 3–45.
- Riethmüller, J.W., *Asklepios. Heiligtümer und Kulte*, I–II, Heidelberg 2005 (Studien zu antiken Heiligtümern, II 1–2).
- Rigg, H.A., *Thallus: the Samaritan?*, HThR 34, 1941, pp. 111–119.
- Rispoli, G., *Ippodamo e Aristotele*, Rendiconti dell'Accademia di Archeologia, Lettere e Belle Arti di Napoli 50, 1975, pp. 229–249.
- Rives, J.B., *Phrygian Tales*, GRBS 45, 2005, pp. 223–244.
- Robin, Ch.J., *Arabie méridionale: l'état et les aromates*, in A. Avanzini (ed.), *Profumi d'Arabia (...)*, Roma 1997, pp. 37–56.
- Rodríguez Moreno, J., *Le héros comme μεταξύ entre l'homme et la divinité dans la pensée grecque*, in V. Pirenne-Delforge, E. Suarez de la Torre (éds), *Héros et héroïnes dans les mythes et les cultes grecs. Actes du Colloque organisé à l'Université de Valladolid du 26 au 29 mai 1999*, Liège 2000 (Kernos suppl. 10), pp. 91–100.
- Roeder, G., *Sarapis*, RE I A 2, 1920, coll. 2394–2426.
- Röhrich, A., *De Clemente Alexandrino Arnobii in irridendo gentiliu cultu deorum auctore*, Diss. Kiel, Hamburg 1892.
- Röllig, W., *Sanchuniaton*, KP IV, 1972, col. 1539.
- Rösler, W., *Die Entdeckung der Fiktionalität in der Antike*, „Poetica“ 12, 1980, pp. 283–319.
- Rohde, E., *Der griechische Roman und seine Vorläufer*, Leipzig ³1914 (reprint Darmstadt ⁵1974).
- , *Psyche. Seelencult und Unsterblichkeitsglaube der Griechen*, 9. und 10. Auflage mit einer Einführung von O. Weinreich, I–II, Tübingen 1925 (reprint Darmstadt 1980).
- Roller, D.W., *Through the Pillars of Herakles. Graeco-Roman Exploration of the Atlantic*, New York-London 2006.
- Roloff, D., *Gottähnlichkeit, Vergöttlichung und Erhöhung zu seligem Leben. Untersuchungen zur Herkunft der platonischen Angleichung an Gott*, Berlin 1970 (UaLG 4).

- Romberg, B., *Studies in the Narrative Technique of the First-Person Novel*, Diss. Lund, Stockholm-Göteborg-Uppsala 1962.
- Romm, J.S., *The Edges of the Earth in Ancient Thought. Geography, Exploration, and Fiction*, Princeton 1992.
- , *Travel*, in T. Whitmarsh (ed.), *The Greek and Roman Novel*, Cambridge 2008, pp. 109–126.
- Rooy, C.A. van, *Studies in Classical Satire and related Literary Theory*, Leiden 1965.
- Rose, H.J., *A Handbook of Latin Literature from the Earliest Times to the Death of St. Augustine*, London 1936 (³1954).
- Rostagni, A., *Poeti alessandrini*, Torino 1916.
- , *Storia della letteratura latina*, I, Torino ²1954.
- Rostovtzeff, M., *Social and Economic History of the Hellenistic World*, III, Oxford ²1953 (reprint Oxford 1998).
- Rostowzew, M., *Studien zur Geschichte des römischen Kolonates*, Leipzig-Berlin 1910 (APF, Beiheft 1) [reprint Stuttgart 1970].
- Roux, G., *L'Architecture de l'Argolide aux IV^e et III^e siècles avant J.-C.*, Paris 1961 (Bibliothèque des Écoles Françaises d'Athènes et de Rome 199).
- , *Delphi. Orakel und Kultstätten*, München 1971.
- Roux, J., *Euripide, Les Bacchantes*, II: *Commentaire*, Paris 1972 (Bibliothèque de la Faculté des Lettres de Lyon 21).
- Rowe, A., *Contribution to the Archaeology of the Western Desert*, IV: *The Great Serapeum of Alexandria*, BJRL 39, 1957, pp. 485–512.
- Rubel, A., *Stadt in Angst. Religion und Politik in Athen während des Peloponnesischen Krieges*, Darmstadt 2000.
- Ruben, W., *Die gesellschaftliche Entwicklung im alten Indien*, I, Berlin 1967.
- Rütten, U., *Phantasie und Lachkultur. Lukians „Wahre Geschichten“*, Diss. München 1996, Tübingen 1997 (Classica Monacensia 16).
- Ruiz-Montero, C., *The Rise of the Greek Novel*, in G. Schmeling (ed.), *The Novel in the Ancient World*. Revised Edition, Boston-Leiden 2003.
- Runia, D.T., *Atheists in Aëtius. Text, Translation and Comments on De Placitis 1.7.1–10, “Mnemosyne”* 49, 1996, pp. 542–576, reprint in J. Mansfeld, D.T. Runia, *Aëtiana. The Method and Intellectual Context of a Doxographer*, III: *Studies in the Doxographical Traditions of Ancient Philosophy*, Leiden-Boston 2010 (Philosophia Antiqua 118), pp. 343–373.
- Rupprecht, K., IEPA ΑΝΑΓΡΑΦΗ, “Philologus” 80, 1924, pp. 350–352.
- Rusch, A., *Thoth*, RE VI A 1, 1936, coll. 351–388.
- Ruska, J., *Tabula Smaragdina. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der hermetischen Literatur*, Heidelberg 1926 (Heidelberger Akten der von-Portheim-Stiftung 16).
- Russo, A., *Quinto Ennio, Le opere minori. Introduzione, edizione critica dei frammenti e commento*, vol. I: *Praecepta, Protrepticus, Saturae, Scipio, Sota*, Pisa 2007 (Testi e studi di cultura classica 40).
- Rusten, J., *Pellaeus Leo*, AJPh 101, 1980, pp. 197–201.
- , *Dionysius Scytobrachion*, Opladen 1982 (Abhandlungen der Rheinisch-Westfälischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, Sonderreihe: Papyrologica Coloniensia 10).
- Rutkowski, B., *The Cult Places of the Aegean*, New Haven-London 1986.
- Rzach, A., *Sibyllen und Sibyllinische Orakel*, RE II A 2, 1923, coll. 2073–2183.
- Sabottka, M., *Das Serapeum in Alexandria. Untersuchungen zur Architektur und Baugeschichte des Heiligtums von der früheren ptolemäischen Zeit bis zur Zerstörung 391 n. Chr.*, Le Caire 2008 (Études Alexandrines 15).
- Sachse, J., *Megasthenes o Indiach*, Wrocław 1981 (Classica Wratislaviensia 8).
- Sacks, K.S., *Diodorus Siculus and the First Century*, Princeton 1990.
- , *Diodorus and His Sources: Conformity and Creativity*, in S. Hornblower (ed.), *Greek Historiography*, Oxford 1994, pp. 213–232.

- Sakellarakis, J.A., *The Idean Cave. Minoan and Greek Worship*, "Kernos" 1, 1988, pp. 207–214.
- Salač, A., ZEYΣ ΚΑΣΙΟΣ, BCH 46, 1922, pp. 160–189.
- Salin, E., *Platon und die griechische Utopie*, München-Leipzig 1921.
- , *Der „Sozialismus“ in Hellas*, in G. Karo et al. (Hgg.), *Bilder und Studien aus drei Jahrtausenden E. Gothein zum siebzigsten Geburtstag als Festgabe dargebracht*, München-Leipzig 1923, pp. 15–59.
- Salviat, F., *Une nouvelle loi Thasienne: Institutions judiciaires et fêtes religieuses à la fin du IV^e siècle*, BCH 82, 1958, pp. 193–267.
- Sanders, L.J., *Dionysius I of Syracuse and the Origins of the Ruler Cult in the Greek World*, „Historia” 40, 1991, pp. 275–287.
- , *From Dionysius to Augustus: Some Thoughts on the Nachleben of Dionysius I of Syracuse*, „Kokalos” 36/37, 1990/1991 [1994], pp. 111–137.
- Santoni, A., *Palefato, Storie incredibili*, Pisa 2000.
- Saprykin, S.I., *Heracleia Pontica and Tauric Chersonesus before Roman Domination (VI–I Centuries B.C.)*, Amsterdam 1997.
- Sartori, M., *Storia, „utopia” e mito nei primi libri della „Bibliotheca historica” di Diodoro Siculo*, „Athenaeum” 62, 1984, pp. 492–536.
- Sauneron, S., *Les prêtres de l'ancienne Égypte*. Édition revue et complétée, Paris 1988.
- Schachermeyr, F., *Alexander der Grosse. Das Problem seiner Persönlichkeit und seines Wirkens*, Wien 1973 (SÖAW, Philos.-hist. Kl. 285).
- Schäfer, H., *Alkibiades und Lysander in Ionien*, WüJbb 4, 1949/1950, pp. 287–308.
- Schanz, M., *Geschichte der römischen Literatur*, I, München³1907.
- Schanz, M., C. Hosius, *Geschichte der römischen Literatur*, I: *Die römische Literatur in der Zeit der Republik*, München⁴1927 (HdA VIII 4) (reprint München 1979).
- Scheer, T.S., *Die Gottheit und ihr Bild. Untersuchungen zur Funktion griechischer Kultbilder in Religion und Politik*, München 2000 (Zetemata 105).
- Schefold, K., *Dichter und Weisen im Sarapieion*, MH 14, 1957, pp. 33–38.
- , *Die Bildnisse der antiken Dichter, Redner und Denker*, Basel²1997.
- Schellkle, K.H., *Virgil in der Deutung Augustins*, Stuttgart-Berlin 1939 (Tübinger Beiträge zur Altertumswissenschaft 32).
- Schepens, G., *L'Autopsie' dans la méthode des historiens grecs du V^e siècle avant J.-C.*, Brussel 1980 (Verhandelingen van de Koninklijke Academie voor Wetenschappen, Letteren en Schone Kunsten van België. Klasse der Letteren. Jaargang 42, Nr. 93).
- , *Polemic and Methodology in Polybius' Book XII*, in *Purposes of History. Studies in Greek Historiography from 4th to the 2nd Centuries B.C. Proceedings of the International Colloquium Leuven 24–26 May 1988*, ed. by H. Verdin, G. Schepens and E. de Keyser, Louvain 1990 (Studia Hellenistica 30), pp. 39–61.
- , *Probleme der Fragmentedition (Fragmente der griechischen Historiker)*, in Ch. Reitz (Hrsg.), *Vom Text zum Buch*, St. Katharinen 2000 (Subsidia Classica 3), pp. 1–29.
- Schiavone, A., *Nascita della giurisprudenza. Cultura aristocratica e pensiero giuridico nella Roma tardorepubblicana*, Roma-Bari²1977.
- Schilling, R., *La déification à Rome. Tradition latine et interférence grecque*, REL 58, 1980, pp. 137–152.
- Schindler, J., *Zeus. A. Sprachgeschichte und mykenische Belege*, RE Suppl. XV, 1978, coll. 999–1001.
- Schippers, J.W., *De ontwikkeling der euhemeristische godencritiek in de christelijke latijnse Literatuur*, Diss. Utrecht, Groningen 1952.
- Schirren, Th., *Philosophos Bios. Die antike Philosophenbiographie als symbolische Form. Studien zur Vita Apollonii des Philostrat*, Heidelberg 2005 (Bibliothek der klassischen Altertumswissenschaften. NF 2. Reihe, Bd. 115).
- Schleif, H., W. Zschietzschmann, *Das Philippeion, in Olympische Forschungen*, hrsg. von E. Kunze, H. Schleif, I, Berlin 1944, pp. 1–52.
- Schmeling, G. (ed.), *The Novel in the Ancient World*. Revised Edition, Boston-Leiden 2003.

- Schmidt, P.L., *Das Corpus Aurelianum und S. Aurelius Victor*, RE Suppl. XV, 1978, coll. 1583–1676.
- , *Grammatik und Rhetorik*, in R. Herzog (Hrsg.), *Restauration und Erneuerung. Die lateinische Literatur von 284 bis 374 n. Chr.*, München 1989 (HLL 5), pp. 101–158.
- , *Historiographie*, in R. Herzog (Hrsg.), *Restauration und Erneuerung. Die lateinische Literatur von 284 bis 374 n. Chr.*, München 1989 (HLL 5), pp. 173–211.
- , *Zu den Quellen der römischen Mythistorie bei den frühen lateinischen Apologeten*, in E.A. Livingstone (ed.), *Papers presented to the Tenth International Conference on Patristic Studies Held in Oxford 1987. Historica, Theologica, Gnostica, Biblica et Apocrypha*, Leuven 1989 (Studia Patristica 19), pp. 99–105.
- Schmidt-Dounas, B., *Geschenke erhalten die Freundschaft. Politik und Selbstdarstellung im Spiegel der Monumente*, Berlin 2000 (= *Schenkungen hellenistischer Herrscher an griechische Städte und Heiligtümer*, hrsg. von K. Bringmann, H. von Steuben, Teil II 2).
- Schmitt, H.H., *Herrscherideal*, Lex. Hellen. 2005, coll. 436–443.
- , *Herrscherkult*, in Lex. Hellen. 2005, coll. 443–452.
- , *Hoftitel*, in Lex. Hellen. 2005, coll. 463–465.
- Schmitt, P., *Connaissance des Îles Canaries dans l'Antiquité*, "Latomus" 27, 1968, pp. 362–391.
- Schnabel, P., *Berosos und die babylonisch-hellenistische Literatur*, Leipzig-Berlin 1923 (reprint Hildesheim 1968).
- Schneider, F., *Über Kalendae Ianuariae und Martiae im Mittelalter*, ARW 20, 1920/1921, esp. pp. 366–370 („Zum Euhemerismus unserer frühmittelalterlichen Quellen über den Kalender“).
- Schneider, P., *L'Éthiopie et l'Inde. Interférences et confusions aux extrémités du monde antique (VIII^e siècle avant J.-C. – VI^e siècle après J.-C.)*, Paris 2004 (Collection de l'École Française de Rome 335).
- Schönbeck, G., *Der locus amoenus von Homer bis Horaz*, Diss. Heidelberg 1962.
- Scholten, H., *Die Sophistik. Eine Bedrohung für die Religion und Politik der Polis?*, Berlin 2003.
- Scholz, U.W., *Der „Scipio“ des Ennius*, „Hermes“ 112, 1984, pp. 183–199.
- , *Die „Satura“ des Q. Ennius*, in J. Adamietz (Hrsg.), *Die römische Satire*, Darmstadt 1986, pp. 25–53.
- Schrader, J., *Palaephateia*, Diss. Berlin 1894.
- Schrenk, G., *γράφια (im griechischen und hellenistischen Gebrauch)*, ThWNT I, 1933, coll. 761–763.
- Schroeder, A., *De ethnographiae antiquae locis quibusdam communibus observationes*, Diss. Halle 1921.
- Schubart, W., *Das hellenistische Königsideal nach Inschriften und Papyri*, APF 12, 1937, pp. 1–26, reprint in H. Kloft (Hrsg.), *Ideologie und Herrschaft in der Antike*, Darmstadt 1979 (WdF 528), pp. 90–122.
- , *Die religiöse Haltung des frühen Hellenismus*, „Der alte Orient“ 35, 2, 1937, pp. 3–29.
- Schubert, Ch., *Mischverfassung und Gleichgewichtssystem. Polybios und seine Vorläufer*, in Ch. Schubert, K. Brodersen (Hgg.), *Rom und der Griechische Osten. Festschrift für H.H. Schmitt*, Stuttgart 1995, pp. 225–235.
- Schürer, E., *The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ (175 B.C. – A.D. 135)* A New English Version Revised and Edited by G. Vermes, F. Millar, M. Goodman, Vol. III 1, Edinburgh 1986.
- Schütrumpf, E., *Aristoteles, Politik, Buch II-III übersetzt und erläutert*, Berlin 1991.
- Schulten, A., *Die Inseln der Seligen*, „Geographische Zeitschrift“ 32, 1926, pp. 229–247.
- Schultz, P., *Leochares' Argead Portraits in the Philippeion*, in P. Schultz, R. von der Hoff (eds), *Early Hellenistic Portraiture: Image, Style, Context*, Cambridge 2007, pp. 205–233.
- , *Divine Images and Royal Ideology in the Philippeion at Olympia*, in *Aspects of Ancient Greek Cult. Context, Ritual and Iconography*. Edited by J.T. Jensen, G. Hinge,

- P. Schultz, B. Wickkiser, Aarhus 2009 (Aarhus Studies in Mediterranean Antiquity 8), pp. 125–193.
- Schumacher, L., *Zum Herrschaftsverständnis Philipps II. von Makedonien*, „Historia“ 39, 1990, pp. 426–443.
- Schur, W., *Scipio Africanus und die Begründung der römischen Weltherrschaft*, Leipzig 1927 (Das Erbe der Alten, II 13).
- Schwabl, H., *Weltschöpfung*, RE Suppl. IX, 1962, coll. 1433–1582.
- , *Zeus*, RE X A, 1972, coll. 253–376.
- , *Zeus*, RE Suppl. XV, 1978, coll. 993–1481.
- Schwartz, E., *Hekataeos von Teos*, RhM 40, 1885, pp. 223–262.
- , *Diodoros*, RE V 1, 1903, coll. 663–704, reprint in *idem, Griechische Geschichtsschreiber (...)*, pp. 35–97.
- , *Dionysios Skytobrachion*, RE V 1, 1903, coll. 929–932, reprint in *idem, Griechische Geschichtsschreiber (...)*, pp. 226–230.
- , *Fünf Vorträge über den griechischen Roman. Das Romanhafte in der erzählenden Literatur der Griechen*. Mit einer Einführung von A. Rehm, Berlin ²1943.
- , *Griechische Geschichtsschreiber*. Herausgegeben von der Kommission für spätantike Religionsgeschichte bei der Deutschen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin, Leipzig 1959.
- Schwinge, E.-R., *Künstlichkeit der alexandrinischen Poesie*, München 1986 (Zetemata 84).
- Scobie, A., *Aspects of the Ancient Romance and its Heritage. Essays on Apuleius, Petronius, and the Greek Romances*, Meisenheim am Glan 1969 (Beiträge zur Klassischen Philologie 30).
- , *Storytellers, Storytelling, and the Novel in Graeco-Roman Antiquity*, RhM 122, 1979, pp. 229–259.
- Scodel, R., *The Trojan Trilogy of Euripides*, Göttingen 1980 (Hypomnemata 60).
- Scott, K., *The Deification of Demetrius Poliorcetes*, AJPh 49, 1928, pp. 137–166, 217–239.
- Scullard, H.H., *Scipio Africanus: Soldier and Politician*, London 1970.
- Sedley, D., *The Origins of Stoic God*, in D. Frede, A. Laks (eds), *Traditions of Theology. Studies in Hellenistic Theology, Its Background and Aftermath*, Leiden-Boston-Köln 2002 (Philosophia Antiqua 79), pp. 41–83.
- See, K. von, *Euhemerismus*, Lexikon des Mittelalters IV, 1989, pp. 86–91.
- Seguin, R., *La religion de Scipion l'Africain*, „Latomus“ 33, 1974, pp. 3–21.
- Seibert, J., *Alexander der Grosse*, Darmstadt 1972 (Erträge der Forschung 10).
- Seiler, F., *Die griechische Tholos. Untersuchungen zur Entwicklung, Typologie und Funktion kunstmäßiger Rundbauten*, Mainz 1986.
- Seland, E.H., *Ports and Political Power in the Periplus: Complex Societies and Maritime Trade on the Indian Ocean in the First Century AD*, Oxford 2010 (Society for Arabian Studies Monographs 9), esp. pp. 17–31 (“Southern Arabia”).
- Seznec, J., *La survivance des dieux antiques. Essai sur le rôle de la tradition mythologique dans l'humanisme et dans l'art de la renaissance*, Diss. Paris 1939, London 1940 (Studies of the Warburg Institute 11). English version: New York and Princeton 1972, Italian version: Torino 1981, German version: München 1990.
- Shipley, D.R., *A Commentary on Plutarch's Life of Agesilaos. Response to Sources in the Presentation of Character*, Oxford 1997.
- Shipley, G., *Little Boxes on the Hillside: Greek Town Planning. Hippodamos and Polis Ideology*, in M.H. Hansen, *The Imaginary Polis*, Copenhagen 2005, pp. 335–403.
- Sieroka, O., *De Euhemero*, Diss. Regimonti Prussorum 1869.
- Simpson, W.K., *Schiffbrüchiger*, Lex. Ägypt. V, 1984, pp. 619–622.
- Singer, C., *The Incense Kingdoms of Yemen: An Outline History of the South Arabian Incense Trade*, in D. Peacock, D. Williams (eds), *Food for the Gods. New Light on the Ancient Incense Trade*, Oxford 2007, pp. 4–27.
- Sitte, A., *Mythologische Quellen des Arnobius*, Diss. Wien 1970 (typescript).

- Skard, E., *Zwei religiös-politische Begriffe: Euergetes-Concordia*, Oslo 1932 (Avhandlingar utgitt av det Norsk Videnskaps-Akademi i Oslo, II. Hist.-Filos. Kl. 1931, 2), esp. pp. 3–66.
- Skutsch, F., *Ennius*, RE V 2, 1905, coll. 2589–2628.
- Skutsch, O., *Notes on Ennian Tragedy*, HSCPh 71, 1966, pp. 125–142, reprint in *idem*, *Studia Enniana*, London 1968, pp. 174–193.
- , *The Annals of Q. Ennius. Edited with Introduction and Commentary*, Oxford 1985.
- Skydsgaard, J.E., *Varro the Scholar. Studies in the First Book of Varro's De rustica*, Hafniae 1968 (Analecta Romana Instituti Danici 4 supplementum).
- Smarczyk, B., *Untersuchungen zur Religionspolitik und politischen Propaganda Athens im Delisch-Attischen Seebund*, München 1990 (Quellen und Forschungen zur antiken Welt 5).
- Snodgrass, A., *Les origines du culte des héros dans la Grèce antique*, in G. Gnoli, J.P. Vernant (éds), *La mort et les morts dans les sociétés anciennes*, Cambridge-Paris 1982, pp. 107–119.
- , *The Archaeology of the Hero*, AION. Sezione di Archeologia e Storia Antica 10, 1988, pp. 19–26, reprint in R. Buxton (ed.), *Oxford Readings in Greek Religion*, Oxford 2000, pp. 180–190.
- Söder, R., *Die apokryphen Apostelgeschichten und die romanhafte Literatur der Antike*, Stuttgart 1932 (Würzburger Studien zur Altertumswissenschaft 3), esp. pp. 211–215 (Icherzählung).
- Solmsen, F., *Cicero „De natura deorum” III 53 ff.*, CPh 39, 1944, pp. 44–47, reprint in *idem*, *Kleine Schriften*, II, Hildesheim 1968 (Collectanea IV 2), pp. 407–410.
- , *Isis among the Greeks and Romans*, Cambridge, Mass.-London 1979 (Martin Classical Lectures 25).
- Sommariva, G., *Il proemio del De rerum natura di Lucrezio e l' inno a Demetrio Poliorcete*, SIFC 54, 1982, pp. 166–185.
- Sonnabend, H., *Die Freundschaften der Gelehrten und die zwischenstaatliche Politik im klassischen und hellenistischen Griechenland*, Hildesheim-Zürich-New York 1996 (Altertumswissenschaftliche Texte und Studien 30).
- Sourvinou-Inwood, Ch., *Myth as History: The Previous Owners of the Delphic Oracle*, in J. Bremmer (ed.), *Interpretations of Greek Mythology*, London 1987, pp. 215–241.
- Speyer, W., *Angebliche Übersetzungen des heidnischen und christlichen Altertums*, JbAC 11/12, 1968/1969, pp. 26–41, reprint in *idem*, *Frühes Christentum im antiken Strahlungsfeld. Ausgewählte Aufsätze*, Tübingen 1989 (WUNT 50), pp. 70–85.
- , *Bücherfunde in der Glaubenswerbung der Antike*, Göttingen 1970 (Hypomnemata 24).
- , *Die literarische Fälschung im heidnischen und christlichen Altertum*, München 1971 (HdA I 2).
- , *Heros*, RAC XIV, 1988, coll. 861–877.
- Spoerri, W., *Späthellenistische Berichte über Welt, Kultur und Götter. Untersuchungen zu Diodor von Sizilien*, Basel 1959 (Schweizerische Beiträge zur Altertumswissenschaft 9).
- , *Diodor von Sizilien* 1, 7/8, MH 18, 1961, pp. 63–82.
- , *Kastor von Rhodos*, KP III, 1969, coll. 151–152.
- , *Leon von Pella*, KP III, 1969, col. 565.
- , *Hekataios von Abdera*, RAC XIV, 1987, coll. 275–310.
- , *Diodorea*, MH 48, 1991, pp. 310–319.
- Sporn, K., *Heiligtümer und Kulte Kretas in klassischer und hellenistischer Zeit*, Heidelberg 2002 (Studien zu antiken Heiligtümern 3).
- Spyridakis, S.V., *Zeus Is Dead: Euhemerus and Crete*, CJ 63, 1968, pp. 337–340, reprint in *idem*, *Cretica. Studies on Ancient Crete*, New Rochelle-New York 1992, pp. 1–7.
- Squillace, G., *Le lettere di Menecrate/Zeus ad Agesilao di Sparta e Filippo II di Macedonia*, “Kokalos” 46, 2004, pp. 175–191.
- , *Menecrate di Siracusa. Un medico del IV secolo a.C. tra Sicilia, Grecia e Macedonia*, Hildesheim-Zürich-New York 2012 (Spudasmata 141).

- Stafford, E.J., *Héraklès: encore et toujours le problème du heros-theos*, "Kernos" 18, 2005, pp. 391–406.
- , *Herakles between Gods and Heroes*, in J.N. Bremmer, A. Erskine (eds), *The Gods of Ancient Greece. Identities and Transformations*, Edinburgh 2010 (Edinburgh Leventis Studies 5), pp. 228–244.
- Stambaugh, J.E., *Sarapis under the Early Ptolemies*, Leiden 1972 (EPRO 25).
- Steier, A., *Myrrha*, RE XVI 1, 1933, coll. 1134–1146.
- Stein, O., *Megasthenes*, RE XV 1, 1931, coll. 230–326.
- , *Thallos 5*, RE V A 1934, col. 1227.
- Steiner, D.T., *Images in Mind. Statues in Archaic and Classical Greek Literature and Thought*, Princeton-Oxford 2001.
- Steinmetz, P., *Allegorische Deutung und allegorische Dichtung in der alten Stoa*, RhM 129, 1986, pp. 18–30.
- , *Die Stoa*, in H. Flashar, (Hrsg.), *Die Philosophie der Antike*, Bd. 4: *Die Hellenistische Philosophie*, Basel 1994, pp. 491–716.
- Stengel, P., *Die griechischen Kultusaltertümer*. Dritte zum großen Teil neubearbeitete Auflage, München ³1920 (HdA V 3).
- Stephens, S.A., *Seeing Double. Intercultural Poetics in Ptolemaic Alexandria*, Berkeley-Los Angeles-London 2003 (Hellenistic Culture and Society 37).
- Stern, J., *Palaephatus, On Unbelievable Tales. Translation, Introduction and Commentary*, Wauconda, Illinois 1996.
- , *Rationalizing Myth: Methods and Motives in Palaephatus*, in R. Buxton, (ed.), *From Myth to Reason? Studies in the Development of Greek Thought*, Oxford 1999, pp. 215–222.
- Stern, M., *Greek and Latin Authors on Jews and Judaism. Edited with Introductions, Translations and Commentary*, I, Jerusalem 1974 (Publications of the Israel Academy of Sciences and Humanities. Section of Humanities).
- , *The Jews in Greek and Latin Literature*, in *The Jewish People in the First Century. Historical Geography, Political History, Social, Cultural and Religious Life and Institutions*, ed. by S. Safrai, M. Stern, vol. II, Assen-Amsterdam 1976 (Compendium Rerum Iudaicarum ad Novum Testamentum 2), pp. 1101–1159.
- Stern, M., O. Murray, *Hecataeus of Abdera and Theophrastus on Jews and Egyptians*, JEA 59, 1973, pp. 159–168.
- Stern, S., *Aristotle on the World-State*, Oxford 1968.
- Steuernagel, C., H. Kees, *Κάσιον ὄρος*, RE X 2, 1919, coll. 2263–2264.
- Stewart, Z., *Il culto del sovrano*, in: R. Bianchi Bandinelli (ed.), *Storia e Civiltà dei Greci*, VIII: *La società ellenistica. Economia, diritto, religione*, Milano 1977, pp. 562–577.
- Stier, H.E., *Alexander*, RAC I, 1950, coll. 261–270.
- Stoessl, F., *Der Tod des Herakles. Arbeitsweise und Formen der antiken Sagendichtung*, Zürich 1945.
- Strasburger, H., *Onesikritos*, RE XVIII 1, 1939, coll. 460–467, reprint in *idem, Studien zur Alten Geschichte*, hrsg. von W. Schmitthener, R. Zoepfel, I, Hildesheim-New York 1982 (Collectanea XLII 1), pp. 177–180.
- , *Zum antiken Gesellschaftsideal*. Vorgetragen am 12. Mai 1973, Heidelberg 1976 (Abhandlungen der Heidelberger Akademie der Wissenschaften, Philos.-hist. Kl. 1976, Abh. 4).
- Straten, F.T. van, *Did the Greeks Kneel before Their Gods?*, "Bulletin Antieke Beschaving" 49, 1974, pp. 159–189.
- , *Hierà kalá. Images of Animal Sacrifice in Archaic and Classical Greece*, Leiden-New York-Köln 1995 (RGRW 127).
- Stroheker, K.F., *Dionysios I. Gestalt und Geschichte des Tyrannen von Syrakus*, Wiesbaden 1958.
- Stylianou, P.J., *A Historical Commentary on Diodorus Siculus Book 15*, Oxford 1998.

- Suerbaum, W., *Die Ich-Erzählungen des Odysseus. Überlegungen zur epischen Technik des Odyssee*, „Poetica“ 2, 1968, pp. 150–177.
- , *Untersuchungen zur Selbstdarstellung älterer römischer Dichter: Livius Andronicus, Naevius, Ennius*, Hildesheim 1968 (Spudasmata 19).
- , *Ennius*, DNP III, 1997, coll. 1040–1046.
- , *Q. Ennius*, in *idem* (Hrsg.), *Die archaische Literatur von den Anfängen bis Sulla Tod. Die vorliterarische Periode und die Zeit von 240 bis 78 v. Chr.*, München 2002 (HLL 1), pp. 119–142.
- Sulimani, I., *Diodorus 'Mythistory' and the Pagan Mission. Historiography and Culture-heroes in the First Pentad of the Bibliotheke*, Leiden-Boston 2011 (Mnemosyne suppl. 331).
- Susseml, F., *Geschichte der griechischen Litteratur in der Alexandrinerzeit*, I-II, Leipzig 1891–1892 (reprint Hildesheim 1965).
- Sutton, D., *Critias and Atheism*, CQ 75, 1981, pp. 33–38.
- Swoboda, H., *Zur Beurteilung der griechischen Tyrannis*, „Klio“ 12, 1912, pp. 341–354.
- Szidat, J., *Hippodamos von Milet. Seine Rolle in Theorie und Praxis der griechischen Stadtplanung*, „Bonner Jahrbücher“ 180, 1980, pp. 31–44.
- Taeger, F., *Zum Kampf gegen den antiken Herrscherkult*, ARW 32, 1935, pp. 282–292.
- , *Isokrates und die Anfänge des hellenistischen Herrscherkultes*, „Hermes“ 72, 1937, pp. 355–360.
- , *Charisma. Studien zur Geschichte des antiken Herrscherkultes*, I-II, Stuttgart 1957–1960.
- , *Alexanders Gottkönigsgedanke und die Bewusstseinslage der Griechen und Makedonen*, in *La regalità sacra. Contributi al tema dell' VIII Congresso Internazionale di Storia delle Religioni* (Roma, Aprile 1955), Leiden 1959, pp. 394–406.
- Täubler, E., *Der Chronograph Thallos*, RhM 71, 1916, pp. 572–574.
- Tarn, W.W., *Ptolemy II and Arabia*, JEA 15, 1929, pp. 9–25.
- , *Alexander the Great and the Unity of Mankind*, Proceedings of the British Academy 19, 1933, pp. 123–166 (offprint London 1933), reprint in G.T. Griffith, (ed.), *Alexander the Great. The Main Problems*, Cambridge-New York 1966, pp. 243–286.
- , *Alexander the Great, II: Sources and Studies*, Cambridge 1948 (reprint Cambridge 2002).
- Tate, J., *On the History of Allegorism*, CQ 28, 1934, pp. 105–114.
- Taylor, L.R., *The Divinity of the Roman Emperor*, Middletown, Conn. 1931 (American Philological Association. Philological Monographs 1).
- Ternes, Ch.M., *L'interprétation dite évhémériste dans la "Tractatus de diis gentilium" de Jean Bertels (1544–1607)*, in P.M. Martin, Ch.M. Ternes (éds), *La mythologie. Clef de lecture du monde classique. Hommage à R. Chevalier*, II, Tours 1986 (Collection Caesarodunum 21 bis), pp. 321–331.
- Theiler, W., *Poseidonios, Die Fragmente*, I-II, Berlin-New York 1982 (Texte und Kommentare X 1–2).
- Thesleff, H., *Man and locus amoenus in Early Greek Poetry*, in *Gnomosyne. Menschliches Denken und Handeln in der frühgriechischen Literatur. Festschrift für W. Marg zum 70. Geburtstag*, hrsg. von G. Kurz, D. Müller, W. Nicolai, München 1981, pp. 31–45.
- , *Notes on the Paradise Myth in Ancient Greece*, „Temenos“ 22, 1986, pp. 129–139.
- Thommen, L., *Lakedaimonion Politeia. Die Entstehung der spartanischen Verfassung*, Stuttgart 1996 (Historia Einzelschriften 103).
- , *Sparta. Verfassungs- und Sozialgeschichte einer griechischen Polis*, Stuttgart-Weimar 2003.
- Thompson, D.J., *Philadelphus 'Procession: Dynastic Power in a Mediterranean Context*, in L. Mooren (ed.), *Politics, Administration and Society in the Hellenistic and Roman World. Proceedings of the International Colloquium, Bertinoro 19–24 July 1997*, Leuven 2000 (Studia Hellenistica 36), pp. 365–388.

- Thorne, S.E., *Diktaian Zeus in Later Greek Tradition*, in *The Palaikastro Kouros. A Minoan Chryselephantine Statuette and its Aegean Bronze Age Context*, ed. by J.A. MacGillivray, J.M. Driessen, L.H. Sackett, London 2000 (BSA. Studies 6), pp. 149–162.
- Thraede, K., *Erfinder II (geistesgeschichtlich)*, RAC V, 1962, coll. 1191–1278.
- , *Euhemerismus*, RAC VI, 1966, coll. 877–890.
- Thrams, P., *Hellenistische Philosophen in politischer Funktion*, Hamburg 2001 (Studien zur Geschichtsforschung des Altertums 10).
- Tkač, J., *Εὐδαίμονες νῆσοι*, RE VI 1, 1907, coll. 891–892.
- , *Saba*, RE I A, 1920, coll. 1403–1405 (νῆσοι εὐδαίμονες).
- Tortorelli Ghidini, M., *Epimenide e la teogonia cretese*, in G. Cerri (ed.), *La letteratura pseudoepigrafa nella cultura greca e romana*. Atti di un incontro di studi, Napoli, 15–17 gennaio 1998, Napoli 2000 (AION, sez. filologico-letteraria 22, 2000), pp. 79–95.
- , *Epimenide a Creta: tra biografia e teogonia*, in E. Federico, A. Visconti (ed.), *Epimenide cretese*, Napoli 2001 (Quaderni del Dipartimento di Discipline Storiche „E. Lepore” dell’Università “Federico II”, Napoli, 2), pp. 53–76.
- Totti, M., *Ausgewählte Texte der Isis-und Sarapis-Religion*, Hildesheim-Zürich-New York 1985 (Subsidia Epigraphica 12).
- Trampedach, K., *Platon, die Akademie und die zeitgenössische Politik*, Stuttgart 1994 (Hermes Einzelschriften 66).
- Treu, K., *Roman und Geschichtsschreibung*, „Klio” 66, 1984, pp. 456–459.
- Triebel-Schubert, Ch., U. Muss, *Hippodamos von Milet: Staatstheoretiker oder Stadtplaner?*, „Hephaistos” 5/6, 1983/1984, pp. 37–59.
- Trieber, C., *Forschungen zur spartanischen Verfassungsgeschichte*, Berlin 1871.
- Troiani, L., *L’opera storiografica di Filone da Byblos*, Pisa 1974 (Biblioteca degli studi classici e orientali 1).
- Trüdinger, K., *Studien zur Geschichte der griechisch-römischen Ethnographie*, Diss. Basel 1918.
- Tsigarida, E.B., *The Sanctuary of Zeus Ammon at Kallithea (Chalcidice)*, “Kernos” 24, 2011, pp. 165–181.
- Tümpel, K., *Belos*, RE III 1, 1899, coll. 259–264.
- Tullius, F., *Die Quellen des Arnobius im 4., 5. und 6. Buch seiner Schrift Adversus nationes*, Diss. Berlin, Bottrop i. W. 1934.
- Turcan, R., *Firmicus Maternus, L’erreur des religions païennes. Texte établi, traduit et commenté*, Paris 1982.
- Turner, E.G., *The Hibeh Papyri*, II, London 1955.
- Untersteiner, M., *I sofisti*. Seconda edizione riveduta e notevolmente ampliata, I-II, Milano 1967.
- Usener, H., *Dreiheit. Ein Versuch mythischer Zahlenlehre*, Bonn 1903 (reprint Hildesheim 1966).
- Utzinger, Ch., *Periphrades Aner. Untersuchungen zum ersten Stasimon Sophokleischen “Antigone” und zu den antiken Kulturentstehungstheorien*, Göttingen 2003 (Hypomnemata 146).
- Vahlen, J., *Augustinus und Ennius’ Euhemerus*, Sitzungsberichte der Königl. Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften 1899, pp. 276–279, reprint in *idem, Gesammelte philologische Schriften*, II: *Schriften der Berliner Zeit 1874–1911*, Leipzig-Berlin 1923 (reprint Hildesheim 1970), pp. 533–536.
- , *Ennianae poesis reliquiae*, Lipsiae ²1903 (reprint Lipsiae 1928 and Amsterdam 1963).
- Vallauri, G., *Evemero di Messene. Testimonianze e frammenti con introduzione e commento*, Torino 1956 (Università di Torino. Pubblicazioni della Facoltà di Lettere e Filosofia VIII 3).
- , *Origine e diffusione dell’evemerismo nel pensiero classico*, Torino 1960 (Università di Torino. Pubblicazioni della Facoltà di Lettere e Filosofia XII 5).
- Vasunia, Ph., *The Gift of the Nile. Hellenizing Egypt from Aeschylus to Alexander*, Berkeley-Los Angeles-London 2001 (Classics and Contemporary Thought 8).

- Verbanck-Piérard, A., *Le double culte d'Héraklès: légende ou réalité?*, in A.-F. Laurens (éd.), *Entre homme et dieux. Le convive, le héros, le prophète*, Paris 1989, pp. 43–65.
- Verbruggen, H., *Le Zeus crétois*, Paris 1981 (Collection d'Études Mythologiques).
- Verbrugge, G.P., J.M. Wickersham, *Berosos and Manetho, Introduced and Translated. Native Traditions in Ancient Mesopotamia and Egypt*, Ann Arbor 1996.
- Vermader, J.-M., *La polémique des Apologues latins contre les Dieux du paganisme*, „Recherches Augustiniennes“ 17, 1982, pp. 3–128.
- Vernière, Y., *Îles mythiques chez Diodore de Sicile*, in F. Jouan, B. Deforge (éd.), *Peuples et pays mythiques*. Actes du V^e Colloque du Centre de Recherches Mythologiques de l'Université de Paris X (Chantilly, 18–20 septembre 1986), Paris 1988, pp. 159–167.
- Versnel, H.S., *Philip II and Kynosarges*, „Mnemosyne“ 26, 1973, pp. 273–279.
- , *Heersercultus in Griekenland*, „Lampas“ 7, 1974, pp. 129–163.
- , *Inconsistencies in Greek and Roman Religion, I: Ter Unus. Isis, Dionysos, Hermes. Three Studies in Henotheism*, Leiden-New York-Köbenhavn 1990 (SGRR VI 1).
- , *Inconsistencies in Greek and Roman Religion, II: Transition and Reversal in Myth and Ritual*, Leiden-New York-Köln ²1994 (SGRR VI 2).
- Vetter, P., *Das Sibyllen-Citat bei Moses von Choren*, „Theologische Quartalschrift“ 74, 1892, pp. 465–474.
- Vidal-Naquet, P., *Athens and Atlantis: Structure and Meaning of Platonic Myth*, in *idem, The Black Hunter. Forms of Thought and Forms of Society in the Greek World*, Baltimore-London 1986, pp. 263–284.
- Vilatte, S., *L'insularité dans la pensée grecque: au carrefour de la Géographie, de Ethnographie, et de l'Histoire*, „Revue Historique“ 281, 1989, pp. 3–13.
- , *L'insularité dans la pensée grecque*, Paris 1991 (Annales littéraires de l'Université de Besançon 446, Centre de Recherche d'Histoire Ancienne 106).
- Virgilio, B., *Lancia, diadema e porpora. Il re e la regalità ellenistica. Seconda edizione rinnovata e ampliata con una Appendice documentaria*, Pisa 2003 (Studi ellenistici 14).
- Vischer, R., *Das einfache Leben. Wort- und motivgeschichtliche Untersuchungen zu einem Wertbegriff der antiken Literatur*, Göttingen 1965 (Studien zur Altertumswissenschaft 11).
- Visser, E., *Götter und Kulte im ptolemäischen Alexandria*, Amsterdam 1938.
- Vlastos, G., *Does Slavery Exist in Plato's Republic?*, CPh 63, 1968, pp. 291–295, reprint in *idem, Platonic Studies*, Princeton 1973, pp. 140–146.
- Vogt, E., *Die Schrift vom Wettkampf Homers und Hesiods*, RhM 102, 1959, pp. 193–222.
- Vogt, J., *Die Sklaverei im utopischen Denken der Griechen*, „Rivista Storica dell' Antichità“ 1, 1971, pp. 19–32, reprint in *idem, Sklaverei und Humanität. Studien zur antiken Sklaverei und ihrer Erforschung*, 2. erweiterte Auflage, Wiesbaden ²1972 (Historia Einzelschriften 8), pp. 131–140; English version: *Ancient Slavery and the Ideal of Man*. Translated by Th. Wiedemann, Oxford 1974, pp. 26–38.
- Volkman, H., *Ptolemaios II*, RE XXIII 2, 1959, coll. 1645–1666.
- , *Ptolemaia*, KP IV, 1972, col. 1216.
- Vonderstein, M., *Der Zeuskult bei den Westgriechen*, Wiesbaden 2006 (Palilia 17).
- Vorländer, K., *Geschichte der Philosophie*, hrsg. von E. Metzke, I, Hamburg ⁹1949.
- Vries, J. de, *Forschungsgeschichte der Mythologie*, Freiburg-München 1961 (Orbis Academicus).
- Wacholder, B.Z., *Ps.-Eupolemus' Two Greek Fragments on Abraham*, „Hebrew Union College Annual“ 34, 1963, pp. 83–113.
- , *Eupolemus. A Study of Judaeo-Greek Literature*, Cincinnati-New York-Los Angeles-Jerusalem 1974 (Monographs of the Hebrew Union College 3).
- Wachsmuth, C., *Einleitung in das Studium der alten Geschichte*, Leipzig 1895.
- , *Dromos*, RE V 2, 1905, coll. 1716–1717.
- Wacht, M., *Gütergemeinschaft*, RAC XIII, 1986, coll. 1–59.
- Wächter, Th., *Reinheitsvorschriften im griechischen Kult*, Giessen 1910 (RGVV 9).

- Wagner, J., *Dynastie und Herrscherkult in Kommagene. Forschungsgeschichte und neuere Funde*, „Istanbuler Mitteilungen“ 33, 1983, pp. 177–224.
- , *Die Könige von Kommagene und ihr Herrscherkult*, in *idem* (Hrsg.), *Gottkönige am Euphrat. Neue Ausgrabungen und Forschungen in Kommagene*, Mainz 2000 (Antike Welt. Sonderband), pp. 11–25.
- Wagner, J., G. Petzl, *Relief- und Inschriftfragmente des kommagenischen Herrscherkultes aus Ancoz*, in *Neue Forschungen zur Religionsgeschichte Kleinasien* E. Schwertheim zum 60. Geburtstag gewidmet, hrsg. von G. Heedemann, E. Winter, Bonn 2003 (Asia Minor Studien 49), pp. 85–96.
- Wainwright, G.A., *Zeberged: The Shipwrecked Sailor's Island*, JEA 32, 1946, pp. 31–38.
- Walbank, F.W., *A Historical Commentary on Polybius*, I–III, Oxford 1957–1979 (reprint 1999).
- , *Polemic in Polybius*, JRS 52, 1962, pp. 1–12, reprint in *idem*, *Selected Papers* (...), pp. 262–279.
- , *The Scipionic Legend*, PCPhS 193, 1967, pp. 54–69, reprint in *idem*, *Selected Papers* (...), pp. 120–137.
- , *Polybios*, Berkeley-Los Angeles-London 1972 (Sather Classical Lectures 42).
- , *The Hellenistic World*, Brighton 1981.
- , *Macedonia and Greece*, in CAH ²VII 1, 1984, pp. 221–256.
- , *Monarchies and Monarchic Ideas*, in CAH ²VII 1, 1984, pp. 62–100.
- , *Selected Papers. Studies in Greek and Roman History and Historiography*, Cambridge 1985.
- , *Könige als Götter. Überlegungen zum Herrscherkult von Alexander bis Augustus*, „Chiron“ 17, 1987, pp. 365–382.
- , *Two Hellenistic Processions: a Matter of Self-Definition*, SCI 15, 1996, pp. 119–130, reprint in *idem*, *Polybius, Rome and the Hellenistic World. Essays and Reflections*, Cambridge 2002, pp. 79–90.
- Waldmann, H., *Die kommagenischen Kultreformen unter König Mithridates I. Kallinikos und seinem Sohne Antiochos I.*, Leiden 1973 (EPRO 34).
- , *Der kommagenische Mazdaismus*, Tübingen 1991 (Istanbuler Mitteilungen 37).
- Wardman, A. *Religion and Statecraft among the Romans*, London 1982.
- Warrington, E.H., *Remains of Old Latin*, I, London-Cambridge, Mass. 1935 (⁴1967) [LCL 294].
- Waszink, J.H., *Problems Concerning the Satira of Ennius*, in *Ennius*, Entretiens sur l'Antiquité Classique 17, 1972, pp. 97–147.
- , *Varrone nella letteratura cristiana dei primi secoli*, in *Atti del Congresso Internazionale di Studi Varroniani*, I, Rieti 1976, pp. 209–223.
- Weber, G., *Dichtung und höfische Gesellschaft. Die Rezeption von Zeitgeschichte am Hof der ersten drei Ptolemäer*, Stuttgart 1993 (Hermes Einzelschriften 62).
- , *Herrscher, Hof und Dichter. Aspekte der Legitimierung und Repräsentation hellenistischer Könige am Beispiel der ersten drei Antigoniden*, „Historia“ 44, 1995, pp. 283–316.
- Weber, G.W., *Euhemerismus*, RGA VIII, 1994, pp. 1–16.
- Wehrli, F., *Zur Geschichte der allegorischen Dichtung Homers*, Diss. Basel, Borna-Leipzig 1928.
- Weinreich, O., *Antikes Gottmenschentum* NJWJ 2, 1926, pp. 633–651.
- , *Menekrates Zeus und Salmoneus. Religionsgeschichtliche Studien zur Psychopathologie des Gottmenschentums in Antike und Neuzeit*, Stuttgart 1933 (Tübinger Beiträge zur Altertumswissenschaft 18), reprint in *idem*, *Religionsgeschichtliche Studien*, Darmstadt 1968, pp. 299–434.
- , *Antiphanes und Münchhausen. Das antike Lügenmärlein von den gefrorenen Worten und sein Fortleben im Abendland*, Wien 1942 (SAWW Phil.-hist.Kl. 220, 4).
- , *Römische Satiren*, Zürich 1949.
- Weinstock, J., *Divus Iulius*, Oxford 1971.

- Welles, C.B., *Royal Correspondence in the Hellenistic Period*, New Haven 1934.
- Wellmann, M., *Aegyptisches*, „Hermes“ 31, 1896, pp. 221–253.
- , *Marcellus von Side als Arzt und die Koiraniden des Hermes Trismegistos*, Leipzig 1934 (Philologus suppl. XXVII 2).
- Welwei, K.-W., *Sparta. Aufstieg und Niedergang einer antiken Großmacht*, Stuttgart 2004.
- Wendland, P., *Die hellenistisch-römische Kultur in ihren Beziehungen zu Judentum und Christentum*, Tübingen ^{2–3}1912 (Handbuch zum Neuen Testament I 2).
- Werner, H., *Zum ΔΟΥΚΙΟΣ Η ΟΝΟΣ*, „Hermes“ 53, 1918, pp. 225–261.
- Wesseling, P., *Diodori Siculi Bibliothecae historicae libri qui supersunt*, III, Argentorati 1798.
- West, M.L., *The Dictaeon Hymn to the Kouros*, JHS 85, 1965, pp. 149–159.
- , *Hesiod, The Theogony. Edited with Prolegomena and Commentary*, Oxford 1966.
- , *The Contest of Homer and Hesiod*, CQ 61, 1967, pp. 433–450.
- , *The Hesiodic Catalogue of Women*, Oxford 1985.
- , *Orpheus, Sanchuniathon, and the Origins of the Ionian World Model*, CQ 44, 1994, pp. 289–307.
- , *The East Face of Helicon. The West Asiatic Elements in Greek Poetry and Myth*, Oxford 1997.
- West, St., *Sesostris' Stelae (Herodotus 2.102–106)*, „Historia“ 41, 1992, pp. 117–120.
- Whitley, J., *Early States and Hero Cults: A Re-Appraisal*, JHS 108, 1988, pp. 173–182.
- , *Tomb Cult and Hero Cult. The Uses of the Past in Archaic Greece*, in N. Spencer (ed.), *Time, Tradition and Society in Greek Archaeology. Bridging the “Great Divide”*, London-New York 1995, pp. 43–63.
- Whitmarsh, T., *Prose Fiction*, in J.J. Clauss, M. Cuypers (eds), *A Companion to Hellenistic Literature*, Malden, Mass.-Oxford-Chichester 2010 (Blackwell Companions to the Ancient World), pp. 395–411.
- Wiemer, H.-U., *Bild der Polis oder Bild des Königs? Zur Repräsentationsfunktion städtischer Feste im Hellenismus*, in *Stadtbilder im Hellenismus*, hrsg. von A. Malthaei und M. Zimmermann, Berlin 2009 (Die hellenistische Polis als Lebensform 1), pp. 116–131.
- , *Held, Gott oder Tyrann? Alexander der Grosse im frühen Hellenismus*, „Hermes“ 139, 2011, pp. 179–204.
- Wifstrand Schiebe, M., *The Saturn of the Aeneid – Tradition or Innovation?*, „Vergilius“ 32, 1986, pp. 43–60.
- , *Lactanz und Varro: Beobachtungen zu Inst. 1,13,8 an Hand einiger Stellen der „Civitas Dei“ Augustins*, RhM 137, 1994, pp. 162–186.
- , *Vergil und die Tradition von den römischen Urkönigen*, Stuttgart 1997 (Hermes Einzelschriften 76).
- Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, U. von, *Res gestae divi Augusti*, „Hermes“ 21, 1886, pp. 623–627, reprint in *idem, Kleine Schriften*, V 1: *Geschichte, Epigraphik, Archäologie*, Berlin 1971, pp. 267–271.
- , *Euripides, Hippolytos*, Berlin 1891.
- , *Die Ilias und Homer*, Berlin 1916.
- , *Hellenistische Dichtung in der Zeit des Kalimachos*, I-II, Berlin 1924 (reprint Dublin-Zürich ³1973).
- , *Der Glaube der Hellenen*, I-II, Berlin 1931–1932 (reprint with changed pagination Basel-Stuttgart ³1959).
- Wilcken, U., *Die griechischen Denkmäler vom Dromos des Serapeums von Memphis*, JDAI 32, 1917, pp. 149–203, esp. pp. 149–173.
- , *Zur Entstehung des hellenistischen Königskultes*, SPAW, Philos.-hist.Kl. 1938, pp. 298–321, reprint in A. Wlosok, (Hrsg.), *Römischer Kaiserkult*, Darmstadt 1978 (WdF 372), pp. 218–253.
- Wilhelm, F., *De Minucii Felicis Octavio et Tertulliani Apologetico*, Breslau 1887 (Breslauer Philologische Abhandlungen II 1).

- Will, W., *Athen und Alexander. Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der Stadt von 338 bis 322 v. Chr.*, München 1983 (Münchener Beiträge zur Papyrysforschung und antiken Rechtsgeschichte 77).
- Willems, R.F., *Cretan Cults and Festivals*, London 1962.
- Willrich, H., *Juden und Griechen vor der makkabäischen Erhebung*, Göttingen 1895.
- , *Judaica. Forschungen zur hellenistisch-jüdischen Geschichte und Litteratur*, Göttingen 1900.
- Winiarczyk, M., *Der erste Atheistenkatalog des Kleitomachos*, „Philologus“ 120, 1976, pp. 32–46.
- , *Diagoras von Melos – Wahrheit und Legende*, „Eos“ 67, 1979, pp. 191–213 and „Eos“ 68, 1980, 51–75.
- , *Theodoros ó Ἀθεός*, „Philologus“ 125, 1981, pp. 64–94.
- , *Wer galt im Altertum als Atheist?*, „Philologus“ 128, 1984, pp. 157–183 and „Philologus“ 136, 1992, pp. 306–310.
- , *Nochmals das Satyrspiel „Sisyphos“*, WSt 100, 1987, pp. 35–45.
- , *Methodisches zum antiken Atheismus*, RhM 133, 1990, pp. 1–15.
- , *Antike Bezeichnungen der Gottlosigkeit und des Atheismus*, RhM 135, 1992, pp. 216–225.
- , *Bibliographie zum antiken Atheismus 17. Jahrhundert – 1990*, Bonn 1994.
- , *Wykazy „homines pro diis culti“ w tradycji antycznej*, „Antiquitas“ 24, 1999, pp. 75–80.
- , *La mort et l'apothéose d'Héraclès*, WSt 113, 2000, pp. 13–29.
- , *Das Werk Die Erziehung Alexanders des Onesikritos von Astypalaia (FGrHist 134 F 1–39). Forschungsstand (1832–2005) und Interpretationsversuch*, „Eos“ 94, 2007, pp. 197–250.
- , *Die indischen Weisen bei den Alexanderhistorikern*, „Eos“ 96, 2009, pp. 29–77.
- , *Die hellenistischen Utopien*, Berlin-Boston 2011 (Beiträge zur Altertumskunde 293).
- Winston, D., *The Wisdom of Solomon. A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*, Garden City, N.Y. 1979.
- Winton, R., *Herodotus, Thucydides and the Sophists*, in Ch. Rowe, M. Schofield (eds), *The Cambridge History of Greek and Roman Political Thought*, Cambridge 2000, pp. 89–121.
- Wipprecht, F., *Zur Entwicklung der rationalistischen Mythendeutung bei den Griechen*, I–II, Programm Donaueschingen, Tübingen 1902–1908.
- Wirth, G., *Diodor und das Ende des Hellenismus. Mutmaßungen zu einem fast unbekannten Historiker*, Wien 1993 (SÖAW, Philos.-hist. Kl. 600).
- , *Katastrophe und Zukunftshoffnung. Mutmaßungen zur zweiten Hälfte von Diodors Bibliothek und ihren verlorenen Büchern*, Wien 2007 (SÖAW, Philos.-hist. Kl. 750).
- Wlosok, A. (Hrsg.), *Römischer Kaiserkult*, Darmstadt 1978 (WdF 372).
- , *Lactantius*, in R. Herzog (Hrsg.), *Restauration und Erneuerung. Die lateinische Literatur von 284 bis 374 n. Chr.*, München 1989 (HLL 5), pp. 375–404.
- Wörle, M., *Epigraphische Forschungen zur Geschichte Lykiens, II. Ptolemaios II. und Telmessos*, „Chiron“ 8, 1978, pp. 201–246.
- Woodbury, L., *The Date and Atheism of Diagoras of Melos*, „Phoenix“ 19, 1965, pp. 178–211, reprint in *idem, Collected Writings*, ed. by Ch.G. Brown, Atlanta 1991, pp. 118–150.
- Woodford, S., *Cults of Heracles in Attica*, in *Studies Presented to G.M.A. Hanfmann*, ed. by D.G. Mitten, J.G. Pedley, J.A. Scott, Mainz 1971, pp. 211–225.
- Worstbrock, F.J., *Translatio artium. Über die Herkunft und Entwicklung einer kulturhistorischen Theorie*, „Archiv für Kulturgeschichte“ 47, 1965, pp. 1–22.
- Worthington, I., *Hyperides 5.32 and Alexander the Great's Statue*, „Hermes“ 129, 2001, pp. 129–131.
- , *Philip II of Macedonia*, New Haven-London 2008.
- Wüst, F.R., *Philipp II. von Makedonien und Griechenland in den Jahren von 346 bis 338*, München 1938.

- Wyss, B., *Doxographie*, RAC IV, 1959, coll. 197–210.
- Yunis, H., *The Debate on Undetected Crime and an Undetected Fragment from Euripides' Sisyphus*, ZPE 75, 1988, pp. 39–46.
- Zahrnt, M., *Dions Rückkehr aus Leontinoi*, AHB 14, 2000, pp. 171–179.
- Zambrini, A., *Gli Indikā di Megastene*, ASNP ser. 3, vol. 12, 1982, pp. 71–149 and 15, 1985, pp. 781–853.
- , *Alessandro in India: tra conquista, religione e tolleranza*, in *Politiche religiose nel mondo antico e tardoantico. Poteri e indirizzi, forme del controllo, idee e prassi di tolleranza*. Atti del Convegno internazionale di studi (Firenze, 24–26 settembre 2009), a cura di G.A. Cecconi, Ch. Gabrielli, Bari 2011, pp. 57–66.
- Zeegers-Vander Vorst, N., *Les citations des poètes grecs chez les apologistes chrétiens du II^e siècle*, Louvain 1972 (Université de Louvain. Recueil de travaux d'histoire et de philologie, 4^e sér. fasc. 47).
- Zellentin, H.M., *The End of Jewish Egypt. Artapanus and the Second Exodus*, in G. Gardner, K.L. Osterloh (eds), *Antiquity in Antiquity. Jewish and Christian Pasts in the Greco-Roman World*, Tübingen 2008 (Texte und Studien zum Antiken Judentum 123), pp. 27–73.
- Zeller, E., *Die Philosophie der Griechen in ihrer geschichtlichen Entwicklung*, II 1, Leipzig ⁵1922; III 1, Leipzig ⁴1909 (reprint Darmstadt ⁷2006).
- Zhmud, L., *Revising Doxography: Hermann Diels and His Critics*, “Philologus” 145, 2001, pp. 219–243.
- , *Pythagoras and the Early Pythagoreans*, Oxford 2012.
- Ziegler, K., *Panchāia*, RE XVIII 3, 1949, coll. 493–495.
- , *Firmicus Maternus*, RAC VII, 1969, coll. 946–959.
- Ziehen, L., *Zur Geschichte der antiken Mythendeutung*, Berichte des Freien Deutschen Hochstifts zu Frankfurt a. M., NF 6, 1890, pp. 434–440.
- , θεολόγος, RE V A 2, 1934, coll. 2031–2033.
- Zieliński, T., *Hermes und Hermetik*, ARW 9, 1906, pp. 25–60, reprint in *idem*, *Iresione*, II, Leopolis 1936 (Eus suppl. 8), pp. 198–230.
- Zimmermann, B. (Hrsg.), *Die Literatur der archaischen und klassischen Zeit*, München 2011 (HGL 1).
- Zucker, F., *Spuren von Apollodoros' Περί θεῶν bei den christlichen Schriftstellern der ersten fünf Jahrhunderte*, Diss. München, Nürnberg 1904.
- , *Euhemeros und seine Τερά 'Αναγραφὴ bei den christlichen Schriftstellern*, „Philologus“ 64, 1905, pp. 465–472.
- Zumschlinge, M., *Euhemeros. Staatstheoretische und staatsutopische Motive*, Diss. Bonn 1976.
- Zuntz, G., *On the Etymology of the Name Sappho*, MH 8, 1951, pp. 12–35, esp. 25 ff. (Zeus Kasios and Baal Sapōn).
- Žabkar, L.V., *Hymns to Isis in Her Temple at Philae*, Hanover-London 1988.

Indexes

1. Indexes of names

- Abraham 155
 Achilles 29, 29 n. 10, 41, 46 n. 131, 169, 170
 Acusilaus 33, 116
 Ado of Vienne 153
 Adonis 170
 Aeacus 124 n. 9, 167
 Aelfric 153
 Aeneas 118, 127 n. 29, 167, 169, 172
 Aeolus 133 n. 71, 140
 Aeschylus 41
 Aëtius 149, 165
 Agathocles 111
 Agesilaus 49, 50 n. 152, 58
 Aigipan 23
 Aix 23
 Alabandus 29, 167
 Alcidas 35, 35 n. 67, 36
 Alcmena 31
 Aletes 133 n. 71
 Alexander III the Great 17, 19, 19 n. 38, 32, 52, 54, 54 n. 178, 56–58, 62, 63, 67–69, 82, 83 n. 69, 93 n. 39, 100, 102, 103, 110, 110 n. 8, 111, 131, 147, 163, 170
 Alexander, king of Epirus 55
 Alexander Polyhistor 157 n. 242
 Alexarchus 23 n. 66, 105
 Amalthea 127
 Ammon 22 n. 52, 22 n. 58, 57, 72, 88 n. 12, 94, 94 n. 47, 106, 125, 127, 128, 135, 138
 Amphiarus 29, 167–169
 Amphictyon 32
 Amphilocheus 168, 169
 Amphitryonades (=Heracles) 168
 Amyntas III 54, 54 n. 178, 55
 Antigonus Gonatas 48
 Antigonus Monophthalmus 2, 46, 59
 Antiochus I Soter 63
 Antiochus III the Great 112
 Antiochus I, king of Commagene 95 n. 50, 102, 102 n. 22, 125
 Antiochus of Aegae 39
 Antiphanes of Berge 6
 Antonius Diogenes 148, 148 n. 180,
 Aphrodite 14, 22, 45 n. 124, 60, 93, 153 n. 212, 177
 Aphrodite Urania 23, 23 n. 66
 Apollo 31, 76 n. 28, 90, 91, 94, 96 n. 57, 97, 135, 136, 153 n. 211, 164, 177
 Apollo Maleatas 31
 Apollodorus of Athens 8, 9, 20, 20 n. 42, 134, 161
 Aratus of Soli 121
 Arcas 168
 Arcestratus of Gela 6
 Ares 177
 The Argonauts 39 n. 86, 125 n. 18
 Ariadne 168
 Aristaeus 27, 28 127, 136, 162, 167, 169, 172
 Aristobulus 93 n. 39,
 Aristocles 144
 Aristotle 41, 75 n. 26, 83 n. 72, 103, 107
 Arnobius 6, 67, 120, 133, 133 n. 68, 143 n. 138, 146, 152, 165
 Arrian 145
 Arsinoë II 5 n. 26, 45 n. 124, 62, 62 n. 226, 62 n. 228, 63, 125
 Artapanus 156, 158, 166
 Artemis 76 n. 28, 91, 97, 164
 Asclepius 29, 31, 31 n. 27, 31 n. 30, 31 n. 34, 33, 33 n. 49, 33 n. 55, 68, 143 n. 142, 167–170, 177
 Ataburus 24
 Atargatis 132 n. 63
 Athena 59, 73 n. 13, 92, 139, 153 n. 212
 Athena Alea 88 n. 11
 Athenaeus 6
 Athenagoras 124, 134, 151, 157 n. 242
 Atlas 127, 140, 155
 Atticus 143
 Attis 169
 Augustine 9, 67, 121, 152, 165
 Augustus 137 n. 100, 141, 146
 Bacchus 168
 Bacon, Roger 153

- Basileia 126, 127
 Bellerophon 168
 Belus 92, 134, 136, 155
 Berenice, wife of Ptolemaeus I 45 n. 124, 61
 Berenice, daughter of Ptolemaeus III 45 n. 124
 Berossos 157 n. 243
 Britomartis 169
 Buondelmonti, Cristoforo 39
- Cadmus 24, 100, 162
 Caelus 91
 Caesar 168, 172
 Callimachus of Cyrene 3, 4, 4 n. 23, 5, 5 n. 25, 7, 10, 15, 37, 38, 40, 107, 125, 161, 165
 Callippus 51
 Callisto 168
 Callixinus of Rhodes 61, 62 n. 222
 Calypso 140
 Casius 24, 92
 Cassander 1–3, 7, 59, 60, 71, 100, 102, 161, 164
 Cassius Hemina 140, 165
 Cassius Severus 140 n. 123
 Castor 167–170
 Castor of Rhodes 134, 165
 Castores 169, 170
 Cato the Elder 113, 116, 117
 Cecrops 146
 Celsus 39, 152
 Ceres 91, 151, 169, 170
 Chandragupta 19 n. 38
 Chronus 157 n. 243
 Cicero 40, 117, 120, 122, 142–144, 164
 Cilix 24, 92
 Cinyras 14
 Circe 140
 Clearchus, tyrant of Heraclea 50, 51, 52, 58
 Clement of Alexandria 6, 53, 133, 133 n. 68, 149, 151 n. 208, 152, 165
 Cleopatra, wife of Philip II 54 n. 178
 Clitarchus 17, 17 n. 30, 33
 Clitomachus of Carthage 10, 107, 149
 Columella 10, 11, 115, 115 n. 33
 Commodian 151 n. 203
 Cornelius Labeo 120, 120 n. 67
 Critias of Athens 47, 47 n. 136, 68, 99, 100 n. 6, 105, 105 n. 41, 106
 Cronus 21, 37, 54 n. 178, 68, 86, 90–93, 97, 127, 136, 136 n. 96, 138, 146, 155–157, 157 n. 243, 161, 163, 164, 178
 Crotus 168
- Ctesias 148
 The Curetes 36, 92
 Cybele 128
 Cynosura 168
 Cyrene 136
 Cyril of Alexandria 39
 Cyrus 93 n. 39
- The Dactyls 136, 172
 Damithales 32
 Danaus 41
 Darius 93 n. 39, 95 n. 50, 110 n. 8
 Demeter 29 n. 10, 32, 48, 60, 68, 91, 92, 172
 Demeter Mysia 32
 Demeter Pelasgis 32
 Demetrius of Phalerum 2
 Demetrius Poliorcetes 44 n. 120, 46, 46 n. 127, 59, 59 n. 202, 60
 Democritus of Abdera 47, 47 n. 137, 64, 68, 99, 100 n. 6
 Demophon 29 n. 10
 Diagoras of Melos 128, 144, 145
 Dicaearchus of Messene 2, 85 n. 81
 Dictys of Knossos 140
 Dinarchus of Delos 33 n. 44, 34, 128, 165
 Diodorus Siculus 9, 13, 18, 27, 28, 39 n. 87, 65, 66, 73–75, 77–81, 81 n. 61, 85, 100, 104, 125, 134–136, 150, 152, 161, 162, 165
 Pseudo-Dion of Prusa 50, 50 n. 156
 Dion of Syracuse 44, 46 n. 127, 51, 58
 Dionysius I 50–52, 58, 111
 Dionysius II 44, 50, 51, 58
 Dionysius Scytobrachion 16, 38, 39 n. 86, 40, 125–128, 139 n. 117
 Dionysus 22 n. 50, 27, 28, 32, 33, 33 n. 44, 34, 39, 48, 50, 57, 60, 68, 90, 123, 125–128, 135, 136, 143 n. 141, 162, 167–170, 172, 178
 The Dioscuri 29, 68, 136, 168–170, 172
 Dosiades 4 n. 23, 136 n. 96
 Duris of Samos 49
- Empedocles 43 n. 113
 Ennius 6, 11, 13, 39, 108, 109–122, 142, 146, 147, 161, 164, 165
 Enoch 155
 Ephorus of Cyme 84, 85
 Epicharmus 6
 Epicurus 43 n. 113, 65 n. 240, 107
 Epimenides of Crete 34, 35, 35 n. 66, 136 n. 96
 Epiphanius of Salamis 151 n. 208

- Eratosthenes of Cyrene 8, 9, 20 n. 42, 132, 161, 165
 Erigone 168, 169
 Eupolemus 154, 155
 Pseudo-Eupolemus 155, 158, 166
 Eupolis 41
 Euripides 32, 41, 47
 Eurydice 54, 54 n. 178
 Eusebius of Caesarea 6 n. 34, 13, 27, 134, 137, 137 n. 102, 149, 152, 156 n. 238, 165
 Euthymus of Locri 44 n. 118
 Ezekiel, tragedian 158

 Faunus 167
 Festus 120
 Firmicus Maternus 14, 121, 151, 152, 165
 Flamininus, Quinctius 112
 Frigg 153

 Gaia 157
 Ganymedes 168
 Gellius, Aulus 115
 Geryon 46
 Glaucus 136
 Godfrey of Viterbo 153
 Gorgias 35
 Gregory of Tours 153

 Hades 32, 46, 91, 178
 Halia 172
 Hamor 156
 Hannibal 95 n. 50
 Harmonia 24, 100, 162
 Hebe 29
 Hecataeus of Abdera 16, 16 n. 26, 17, 20, 20 n. 44, 23 n. 60, 64–66, 68, 82, 83, 86, 89, 97, 132, 136, 161, 163, 164
 Hecataeus of Miletus 46, 68, 162
 Hector 41, 170
 Helena 29, 168
 Helios 126, 127, 135, 178
 Hellanicus of Mytilene 46
 Henry VI, emperor 153
 Hephaestus 48, 94, 135, 172
 Hera 29, 53, 54 n. 178, 92, 135, 153 n. 212
 Hera Lacinia 94 n. 45
 Heracles 27–30, 30 n. 17, 30 n. 19–21, 31 n. 24, 46, 53, 68, 93, 93 n. 42, 110 n. 6, 123, 136, 162, 167–170, 172
 Heraclitus of Ephesus 4 n. 19, 151 n. 208
 Hermes 22 n. 52, 52, 58, 76 n. 28, 91, 91 n. 29, 94, 94 n. 46, 97, 135, 156, 164, 170, 179

 Herodorus of Heraclea 46
 Herodotus 30, 66, 76 n. 29, 82, 84, 86, 93, 95, 96 n. 62, 97, 163, 164
 Herondas 31 n. 30
 Hesiod 4 n. 19, 29, 31, 33, 35, 35 n. 68, 36
 Hesperus 127
 Hestia 91, 93, 172
 Hierombalus 138 n. 105
 Hippo 133 n. 67
 Hippodamus of Miletus 82
 Hipponax 3
 Homer 4 n. 19, 16, 16 n. 25, 18, 19, 20 n. 40, 35, 35 n. 68, 36, 46 n. 125, 68, 124, 131, 148, 161, 162, 164
 Horatius 113 n. 24
 Horus 66 n. 245, 135
 Hyginus 165
 Hyperion 126, 127

 Iamblichus 43 n. 113
 Iambulus 16, 16 n. 27, 17, 20, 20 n. 44, 77, 90, 148
 Icarus 32, 168
 Indibilis 110 n. 8
 Ino 29, 167, 168, 170
 Io 43 n. 114
 Isho'dad of Merv 34 n. 63
 Isidore of Seville 153
 Isis 22 n. 50, 23 n. 58, 29 n. 10, 95, 95 n. 56, 96 n. 63, 128, 135, 172
 Isocrates 35, 43 n. 115, 51, 82, 86, 163

 Janus 141
 Japetus 157, 157 n. 243
 Jesus Christ 151, 153 n. 211
 John Hyrcanus 153 n. 237
 John Malalas 39, 140, 154
 John Tzetzes 154
 Josephus Flavius 137, 137 n. 100
 Julius Africanus 134
 Julius Hyginus 11, 141, 165
 Juppiter 92, 110, 110 n. 6, 121, 124 n. 9, 141, 142, 143 n. 141, 143 n. 142, 153
 Juppiter Ataburius 24 n. 68
 Juppiter Belus 92 n. 35
 Juppiter Capitolinus 110
 Juppiter Casius 24 n. 68
 Juppiter Labrayndius 24 n. 68
 Juppiter Sabazius 23 n. 60
 Juppiter Triphylus 92
 Justin 141

 Labrayndus 24
 Lachares 60

- Lactantius 9, 13, 14, 23 n. 67, 114–122, 140, 140 n. 122, 142, 150, 152, 156, 161, 164, 165
 Laomedon 128 n. 45
 Laosthenidas 136 n. 96
 Latinus 127 n. 29
 Leochares 54
 Leon of Pella 66–68, 131–133
 Lesches 36 n. 72
 Leucothea 151 n. 208, 169
 Liber 22 n. 52, 151, 167, 168–170
 Linus 126, 126 n. 18
 Lucian of Samosata 17, 37, 39, 147, 148
 Lucretius 122
 Lycurgus of Sparta 84, 84 n. 75, 152 n. 208
 Lycurgus of Thrace 32, 135
 Lysander 48–50, 52 n. 167, 58, 68, 163
 Lysimachus 2, 44 n. 120, 59

 Machaon 31
 Macrobius 146
 Magas 5 n. 25
 Manetho 66
 Manilius, senator 120, 122 n. 75,
 Martin of Braga 151, 153, 154
 Megasthenes 17, 17 n. 30, 19, 19 n. 38, 33, 82, 83, 86, 145, 146, 163
 Melicertes 29, 168–170
 Melqart 30, 30 n. 22, 93
 Menecrates of Syracuse 52, 52 n. 170
 Mercurius 169
 Minerva 169, 170
 Minos 34, 40, 84, 169, 172
 Minucius Felix 9, 23 n. 58, 140 n. 122, 141 n. 123, 152, 165
 The Minyads 32
 Mnaseas of Patara 132, 165
 Mopsus 168, 169
 Moses 156
 Moses of Chorene 157 n. 243
 Mother of Gods 128
 Musaeus 156
 Musicanus 74 n. 21, 75 n. 25, 82 n. 68
 Myrtilus 168
 Mysius 32

 Nausicaa 41
 Nearchus 17, 17 n. 30, 19, 78, 83, 83 n. 69, 85, 85 n. 83, 86, 93 n. 39, 163
 Nepos, Cornelius 113 n. 23, 140, 142, 165
 Neptunus 111, 111 n. 12
 Nicagoras, tyrant of Zeleia 50, 52
 Nicagoras of Cyprus 132–133, 165
 Nicanor 56
 Nicanor of Alexandria 133 n. 67
 Nicanor of Cyprus 132, 132 n. 67
 Noah 153, 155
 Nonius Marcellus 118 n. 48
 Nonnus of Panopolis 39
 Numa 114 n. 27

 Odin 153
 Odysseus 41, 140
 Oeneus 32
 Olympias 54, 67, 131
 Onesicritus of Astypalaia 17, 17 n. 30, 19, 74 n. 21, 78, 82, 82 n. 68, 86, 93 n. 39, 163
 Onomacritus 29 n. 13
 Ops 91
 Origen 39, 150
 Orion 172
 Orosius 118 n. 48
 Orpheus 126, 156
 Osiris 22 n. 50, 22 n. 52, 66 n. 245, 125, 135, 168, 170, 172
 Osymandias 65
 Othinus 154

 Palaemon 29, 167, 168
 Palaephatus 46, 142 n. 131, 145
 Pan 23, 168
 Panaetius of Rhodes 129 n. 47
 Parmenion 3, 4
 Parmeniscus 3 n. 16
 Patroclus 170
 Pausanias 54, 54 n. 177–178, 55, 55 n. 180, 61 n. 218
 Paul, the apostle 149
 Peisistratus 30, 30 n. 20
 Pelasgus 32
 Pentheus 32
 Pericles 41
 Persaeus of Citium 48, 107, 124, 130, 130 n. 50, 131, 165
 Persephone 32, 92
 Perseus 34, 128, 168–170
 Petrus Comestor 153
 Pherecydes of Athens 33, 116
 Pherecydes of Syros 116 n. 40
 Philip II 43 n. 115, 50, 52 n. 167, 53–55, 58, 68, 163
 Philippides 60
 Philo of Byblos 94, 137–139, 165
 Philochorus of Athens 34, 146
 Photius 148

- Phytalus 32
 Picus 167
 Pindar 4 n. 19, 30, 31, 33
 Plato 4 n. 19, 16, 19, 43 n. 113, 51, 52, 75, 75 n. 26, 78, 78 n. 40, 82, 84, 84 n. 78, 85 n. 81, 86, 90, 90 n. 23, 93, 94 n. 43, 94 n. 46, 95, 97, 106, 107, 116, 161, 163, 164
 Plautus 41 n. 107, 110 n. 6, 111 n. 12
 Pliny the Elder 120, 120 n. 64
 Plutarch of Chaeronea 9, 49, 49 n. 150, 50 n. 152, 60 n. 214, 67, 151 n. 208, 161
 Pluto 14
 Podalirius 31
 Pollux 167–170
 Polybius 8, 9, 9 n. 52, 103, 111 n. 12, 133, 133 n. 71, 165
 Polydorus, Vergilius 153
 Pompeius Trogus 119 n. 51, 141, 165
 Pompey the Great 134
 Porphyry of Tyre 39, 137 n. 102, 138 n. 105
 Poseidon 60, 89, 91, 93, 94 n. 43, 179
 Posidonius 65 n. 240
 Praxibulus, archon 66 n. 247
 Prodicus of Ceos 48, 48 n. 140–141, 68, 99, 100 n. 6, 106, 107, 123, 124, 130, 130 n. 50, 131, 162, 165
 The Proitids 32
 Proserpina 14, 151
 Protagoras of Abdera 4 n. 19, 116
 Protesilaus 169
 Ptah 94, 135
 Ptolemy I Soter 2, 5 n. 25, 57, 59, 60, 61, 61 n. 222
 Ptolemy II Philadelphus 5, 5 n. 26, 7, 57, 61, 61 n. 222, 62, 62 n. 226, 63, 64, 66, 68, 101, 125
 Ptolemy III Euergetes 3
 Pythagoras 39, 43 n. 113, 93 n. 42, 94 n. 46
 Pytheas of Massalia 8, 9
 Pythia 84 n. 75
 Quirinus 167, 168, 170
 Rabanus Maurus 153
 Re-Atum 135
 Rhea 54 n. 187, 91, 127, 146
 Rhesus 41
 Romulus 127 n. 29, 167–169
 Sabbe 157
 Sambethe 157
 Sanchuniathon 94, 137–139
 Sarapis 3 n. 16, 96 n. 63
 Saturn /Saturnus 91, 118 n. 51, 137 n. 99, 141, 141 n. 125, 142, 165
 Saxo Grammaticus 153
 Scamander 46 n. 131
 Scipio Africanus 109–114, 122, 164
 Selene 126, 127, 179
 Seleucus I Nicator 2, 44 n. 120, 63, 63 n. 231
 Seneca 117 n. 46
 Servius 141, 141 n. 131
 Sesostris 95 n. 50
 Set 135
 Sibyl 157, 157 n. 243
 Sicimus 156
 Sisyphus of Cos 140, 165
 Snorri Sturluson 154
 Solomon 155
 Solon 84, 95
 Sopheithes 75 n. 25
 Sosicrates 136 n. 96
 Soteira (=Artemis) 170
 Stesichorus 33
 Strabo 9, 31 n. 30, 161
 Suetonius 140, 141 n. 124
 Taaotos 137, 138 n. 105
 Telemachus of Athens 32
 Tennes 29, 172
 Tertullian 120, 124, 140 n. 122, 141 n. 123
 Teuth 22 n. 52
 Thales 4 n. 19
 Thallus 136, 137, 158, 165
 Thamus 22 n. 52
 Themis 92
 Theodore of Cyrene 10
 Theodore of Mopsuestia 34, 35 n. 63
 Theodoret of Cyrus 149, 152, 165
 Theodotus 156, 158, 166
 Theophilus of Antioch 152, 157 n. 242, 165
 Theophrastus of Eresos 2, 23 n. 60, 66 n. 247, 105
 Theopompus of Chios 9 n. 52, 20, 50 n. 152, 151 n. 203
 Theseus 167, 169, 172
 Thetis 29 n. 10
 Thor 153
 Thoth 91 n. 29, 135, 138, 138 n. 105, 156
 Thymoites 126
 Tiberius 137
 Timaeus 9 n. 52, 85 n. 82
 Titaia 126

- Titan 91, 157, 157 n. 243
 The Titans 128, 136, 156
 Triptolemus 29 n. 10, 169
 Trisaules 32
 Trophonius 168, 169
 Tyndareus 29, 167
 The Tyndaridae 167–169
 Typhon 135

 Uranus 21, 22 n. 50, 23, 27, 28, 28 n. 6,
 68, 86, 90–92, 92 n. 38, 93, 97, 106,
 124 n. 9, 126, 127, 157, 161–164, 179

 Varro 39, 39 n. 92, 40, 67, 120, 122, 134,
 140, 142, 142 n. 135, 144, 164, 165
 Velchanos 36
 Velleius 142, 143,
 Venus 124 n. 9, 151
 Vergil 118 n. 51, 141
 Verrius Flaccus 140, 141 n. 128
 Vesta 91

 Xenophanes of Colophon 151 n. 208

 Yahveh 155

 Zamolxis 169
 Zeno of Citium 48
 Zeus 5, 20–23, 28, 28 n. 6, 31, 33–36,
 37 n. 76, 38–40, 40 n. 93, 41, 52, 53
 n. 170, 54 n. 178, 57, 58, 68, 72, 73
 n. 13, 76, 84, 86, 87, 90–92, 92 n. 38,
 93, 94 n. 43, 96, 96 n. 61, 97, 101,
 103, 107, 123, 124 n. 9, 127, 128, 135,
 136, 147, 148 n. 180, 155, 161–164,
 172, 179
 Zeus Aigiochus 23
 Zeus Ammon 22 n. 58, 72 n. 7, 110 n. 8
 Zeus Ataburius 92
 Zeus Belus 32 n. 42, 92 n. 35
 Zeus Casius 92
 Zeus Dictaeon 37
 Zeus Labrayndius 92
 Zeus Laprius 92
 Zeus Molio 92
 Zeus Panchaeon 3, 147
 Zeus Philippios 32 n. 42, 53
 Zeus Triphylius 21, 78, 86, 87, 89, 96, 97,
 164
 Zeus Velchanos 36 n. 75
 Zrvan 157 n. 243

2. Index of geographical and ethnic names

- Achaca 32
 Acragas 6, 24 n. 68, 133
 Aegae 55, 58
 Aetolia 32
 Aetolians 60
 Africa 9, 71 n. 3, 114, 118 n. 48
 Alexandria 3, 4, 7, 57, n. 198, 62, 144, 161
 The Amazons 125, 126 n. 18
 Amphipolis 52 n. 167
 Andros 95 n. 56
 Arabia 2, 135
 Arabia Felix 2, 8, 22, 32, 71, 71 n. 3, 161,
 162
 Arabian Peninsula 2
 Arcadia 143 n. 142
 Argolis 32
 Argos 32, 34, 88 n. 11, 128
 Arsinoeia 44 n. 120
 Asia 32, 132, 143 n. 141
 Asia Minor 32, 56, 102, 118, 118 n. 48
 Assyria 134
 Asterusia 72
 Athens 10, 31, 31 n. 34, 32, 56, 57, 59, 60,
 88 n. 11, 143 n. 141, 144, 153
 Athens, prehistoric 73 n. 13, 83 n. 71, 84, 95
 Athenians 30, 41, 46, 53, 53 n. 176, 60
 Athos, peninsula 105
 Atlantic Ocean 9, 17, 17 n. 28
 Atlantioi 125, 126, 126 n. 18, 127
 Atlantis 16, 16 n. 24, 16 n. 26, 75 n. 25, 78
 n. 43, 84, 89, 89 n. 15, 90, 90 n. 23, 93,
 94 n. 43, 97, 161, 164
 Atlas 127
 Attica 30 n. 20, 32, 60, 139, 146
 Aulacia 91

 Babylon 2, 32, 56, 157, 157 n. 243
 Babylonia 22, 92, 162
 Babylonians 155
 Bactria 32, 57
 Baecula 111
 Bangala 18 n. 35
 Black Sea 50, 58
 Britain 84 n. 73
 Byblos 29 n. 10

 Caria 23, 24 n. 68, 162
 Carthage 133 n. 71

- Cassiopeia 24 n. 68
 Caucasus 178
 Ceylon 18, 18 n. 35
 Chaeronea 53
 Chalcis 112
 Chaldaeans 74, 74 n. 19
 Cilicia 22, 24, 89 n. 20, 92, 162
 Claros 88 n. 11
 Coele-Syria 71
 Commagene 95 n. 50, 102, 125
 Corcyra 24 n. 68, 60
 Cos 6, 7, 30 n. 21
 Cretans 34, 38–40, 72, 73, 85, 96 n. 57
 Crete 4, 23, 34, 36, 40, 68, 76, 83, 84, 84
 n. 77, 91, 93, 96, 97, 128, 143 n. 142,
 153, 162, 164
 Croton 94 n. 45
 Cyme 95 n. 56
 Cynosura 143 n. 142
 Cyprus 14, 23, 93, 162
 Cyrane 5 n. 25
- Dalis 73
 Dalmatians 85 n. 85
 Delos 88
 Delphi 34, 84 n. 75, 88, 88 n. 11, 128, 178
 Demetrias 44 n. 120
 Dicte 37, 39
 Didyma 88, 88 n. 11
 Diospolis 135
 Dodona 88 n. 11
 Doia 72 n. 8
 Doians 22 n. 58, 72, 73, 106
- Egypt 7, 7 n. 42, 17, 22, 24 n. 68, 27,
 27 n. 3, 63, 64, 65 n. 243, 66, 71, 74
 n. 19–20, 81, 82, 86, 89, 89 n. 18, 95,
 97, 127, 134, 135, 156, 162, 163
 Egyptians 89, 134, 155
 Eleusis 32, 88 n. 11
 Elim 158, 159
 Elysium 19, 90
 England 153
 Ephesus 44 n. 120
 Epians 46
 Epidaurus 31, 31 n. 27, 31 n. 30, 177
 Epirus 46, 55
 Eresus 32, 53
 Ethiopia 27, 27 n. 3, 77, 135
 Euphrates 83 n. 69
 Europe 8, 132, 135
- Gades 93 n. 42
 Gaul 9, 9 n. 53
- Gortyn 36
 Granicus 52
 Greece 83, 89, 126 n. 20, 134
 Greeks 17, 19, 30, 30 n. 21, 32, 44, 45, 56
 n. 188, 58, 74 n. 20, 77, 78, 82, 84, 85,
 86, 89, 101, 108, 112, 125, 155, 164
 Gythion 112
- Hagia Triada 36
 Heliopolis 66, 135
 Helixioia 16, 16 n. 26, 90, 97, 161, 164
 Hellespont 135
 Heraclea Pontica 51
 Hermupolis 94 n. 46
 Hespera 126
 Hesperia 16 n. 27
 Hiera, island 71, 72, 79, 80, 81, 86, 104,
 104 n. 34, 163
 Himalayas 17, 79
 Hyperboreans 16, 90
 Hyracia 73
- Ida 37, 39, 39 n. 92
 India 17, 19 n. 38, 32, 33, 33 n. 44, 34, 56,
 58, 71 n. 3, 74 n. 21, 75 n. 25, 77, 79,
 82, 83 n. 69, 86, 127, 128, 135, 136,
 145 n. 163, 155 n. 225, 163
 Indians 72, 73, 85
 Indian Ocean 2, 8, 16, 16 n. 27, 17, 18,
 71, 79, 161
 Indus 83 n. 69
 Ios 95 n. 56
 Island of the Sun 16 n. 27, 17, 77, 77 n. 36,
 78 n. 43, 90,
 Isle of the Blessed 19, 90
 Italy 6, 92, 118 n. 51, 141, 141 n. 125
- Jauf 2
 Jerusalem 155
 Jews 23, 23 n. 60, 94, 97, 154–159, 162,
 164, 166
 Juktas 39, 39 n. 93
- Kallipolis 78 n. 40
 Kanopos 45 n. 124
 Kishm, island 18, 18 n. 35
 Knossos 36, 39, 93
 Kynosarges 53
- Latium 92, 118
 Leontini 51
 Lernaean Swamp 34
 Lesbos 32, 53, 90
 Libya 126 n. 18, 132

- Libyans 127
 Lipari Islands 6, 24 n. 68, 85, 85 n. 86
 Lydia 32
 Lyttos 36

 Macedonia 7, 7 n. 42, 50, 53, 161
 Magna Graecia 85, 85 n. 82, 94 n. 45
 Marathon 30 n. 20
 Maroneia 95
 Mauretania 87 n. 5
 Media 32
 Mediterranean Sea 16, 30
 Memphis 4, 4 n. 19, 57
 Messene 5, 5 n. 28, 6, 6 n. 29, 85 n. 86, 161
 Miletus 61
 Mosynoeci 76 n. 32, 96
 Munichia 31, 59
 Mylasa 24 n. 68
 Mysia 52

 Near East 134
 New Carthage 110 n. 8, 111, 111 n. 12
 Nysa, city 126

 Oceanis 73
 Oceanites 72, 73
 Oita 29
 Olympia 53, 56
 Olympus 30, 30 n. 19
 Olympus Triphylian 73, 91, 93
 Ophir 155, 155 n. 225
 Orchomenus 32

 Palaikastro 36, 37, 37 n. 76
 Palestine 23, 89 n. 20, 162
 Pamphylia 110 n. 8
 Panara 73, 73 n. 12, 77, 79, 80, 87, 104
 Panchaea 7, 8, 17, 18, 20, 21, 22 n. 58, 71–81, 86, 90, 92, 93, 96, 96 n. 61, 97, 103, 104, 104 n. 34, 106, 124 n. 9, 155, 158, 161, 163
 Panchaeans 72, 73, 77
 Pellene 32
 Peloponnese 5, 6, 6 n. 29, 87 n. 1, 112
 Pelusium 24 n. 68
 Perge 110 n. 8
 Persia 32, 58, 83 n. 69
 Persian Gulf 18
 Petsopha 37
 Phaistos 36
 Phaselis 110 n. 8
 Pheneos 32
 Phoenicia 23, 71, 126 n. 20, 162
 Phoenicians 155
 Phrygia 32
 Pillars of Hercules 16
 Piraeus 31, 59
 Pydna 55

 Ras Shamra 138
 Red Sea 135, 155
 Rhacotis 3, 3 n. 164
 Rhipaeon Mountains 17
 Rhodes 23, 24 n. 68, 144, 162
 Rhodians 60
 Romans 77, 108, 109, 110
 Rome 112, 114 n. 26, 134, 146
 Roussolakkos 37

 Sabaeans 76 n. 32, 96
 Samaria 155
 Samaritan 137, 137 n. 100
 Samos 29, 41, 49, 49 n. 148, 52 n. 167, 58, 163
 Sardinia 113, 113 n. 23
 Scepsis 59
 Scythians 72, 73, 85
 Shechem 156
 Sicilians 6
 Sicily 5, 6, 118, 178
 Sicyon 30 n. 21, 44 n. 120, 161
 Sidon 24, 100
 Siwah Oasis 57, 88 n. 11
 Socotra 18, 18 n. 35
 Spain 9, 9 n. 53, 85
 Sparta 56, 57, 83, 84, 84 n. 77
 Strait of Messina 133 n. 71
 Suebi 85 n. 85
 Syracusans 51
 Syracuse 44, 50–52, 58
 Syria, the island 16, 16 n. 25, 161
 Syria, the country 22, 24 n. 68, 89 n. 20, 92, 162
 Syrian 137 n. 100

 Taenarun 46
 Taprobane 18 n. 35
 Tegea 6, 6 n. 34, 88 n. 11
 Thasos 30, 30 n. 21, 49, 56, 58
 Thebans 152 n. 208
 Thebes 32, 135, 178
 Thessaloniki 95 n. 56
 Thessaly 31, 44 n. 120
 Thrace 32, 41, 95, 135
 Trachis 29
 Tricca 31, 31 n. 27, 31 n. 30
 Triton, river 16 n. 27, 126

Tritonis, lake 16 n. 27, 126
 Troad 59
 Troy 41
 Tyre 30, 93, 155
 Uranopolis 23 n. 66, 105
 Urphe or Uphre 155

Vaccaei 85
 Yemen 2
 Zama 114
 Zea 31
 Zeleia 52

3. Index of subjects

Academy 10, 52, 107
 adyton 138
 administration of justice 76, 96, 97
 Alexandria 56
 altar/altars 40 n. 93, 49, 50, 53, 59, 60
 Ammoneion 88 n. 11
 animals 17, 18, 21, 37, 78, 78 n. 43, 88, 105, 162
 Antigonis, phyle 59
 apotheosis 28 n. 6, 29, 30, 30 n. 17, 66, 108, 109 n. 3, 112, 123, 130, 131, 134, 136, 138 n. 108, 145, 146, 150, 152, 164, 165
 aretologies of Isis 94, 95, 95 n. 55
 Asclepieion 31
 astrology 74, 124, 126, 155
 astronomy 22, 23
 atheism 99 n. 3, 106, 107, 133, 148, 149, 165
 atheist 8, 10, 99, 99 n. 3, 100, 100 n. 9, 149, 150, 152, 165
 attire 76, 76 n. 29, 96, 96 n. 62
 autopsy 21 n. 47
 belief in gods 47, 48, 99, 104–107, 109, 139, 162
 benefactions 27, 41, 42, 44, 58, 68, 76, 91, 92 n. 38, 96, 124, 127, 135, 138, 147, 150, 153, 164, 165
 benefactor 48, 101, 124, 125, 131, 136, 152, 153, 165
 benefactor king 45, 58
 Berenikeion 64
 birds 18, 78, 89
 brotherhood of all people 105, 106, 108, 164
 cannibalism 22, 22 n. 50, 124 n. 9, 135, 162
 catalogue of atheists (index atheorum) 10, 66 n. 248, 99, 99 n. 1, 107, 149, 152
 cave, Idacan 39
 chryselephantine statues 37, 54
 civilisation 138, 153

communism 74 n. 21
 craftsmen 73, 74
 credibility 20, 21, 28, 49, 50 n. 156, 53
 criticism of religion 39
 cult table 87 n. 8
 cult statue 59, 59 n. 200
 Cyrenaic school 2 n. 11, 99, 99 n. 2
 death sentence 77, 104
 deification 27–29, 56 n. 188, 64, 68, 92, 101, 102, 104, 108, 109, 109 n. 3, 114, 122–124, 127 n. 29, 136, 136 n. 96, 145, 158, 162, 164
 deification through fire 29, 29 n. 10, 30
 deified benefactors 48, 68, 130, 154, 162
 deified kings/rulers 64, 66, 86, 138, 152
 deity, eternal 129
 Demetrias, phyle 59
 Demetriaia 60, 60 n. 214
 Demetrian, month 60
 desacralisation of myths/mythology 47, 68, 162
 deified humans/people 9, 28, 66, 67, 99, –101, 106, 107, 123, 131–133, 137, 138, 140, 142, 144, 149, 150, 152, 153, 158, 162, 164, 165
 diet 76
 Dionysia 60, 60 n. 214,
 discovery of book 94, 94 n. 49, 139, 164
 discovery of island 2, 8, 17, 18, 71, 79, 161
 discovery of stele 20, 94, 94 n. 49, 95, 97, 139, 139 n. 117, 164
 distant lands 84
 distribution of crops and livestock 20, 74–76, 96, 97, 103, 163
 divine cult 45, 51, 58, 58 n. 199, 124, 153
 divine honours 49, 52, 57, 58, 68, 101, 112, 126, 127, 135, 136, 163, 164
 doxographer 9, 10
 doxographical tradition 6, 99, 152, 165
 dromos 88, 88 n. 9, 89, 97, 163
 dynastic cult 54, 63

- economy, collective 83, 85, 85 n. 85, 85 n. 86, 86, 103, 163
 Egyptian gods 64, 66, 151 n. 208
 Egyptian hieroglyphs 86, 90, 97, 164
 Egyptian influence 81 n. 62, 94, 95, 95 n. 55, 144 n. 149, 164
 Egyptian priest/priests 67, 68, 84, 95–97, 97 n. 64, 131, 135, 164
 Egyptian religion 65, 156
 Egyptian society 82, 82 n. 63
 Egyptian steles 94 n. 46
 Egyptian temple 88, 89, 94, 97, 163
 emergence of culture 64, 105, 105 n. 44, 162
 encomium/encomia 76, 95, 96, 97, 164
 ethnography 84,
 euergetism 28 n. 6, 41–46, 58, 66, 68, 92 n. 38, 101 n. 17, 106, 108, 123–125, 131, 147, 152, 162
 Euhemerism, negative 123, 152, 165
 Euhemerism, positive 123
 Euhemerism, Stoic 129–131, 150, 165
- family life 77, 86, 163
 farmers 73, 77, 86, 103, 163
 fiction 20 n. 40, 20 n. 44
 fictitious journey 19 n. 40
 frankincense 17, 71, 71 n. 3, 72, 79, 80, 81, 86, 163
 first-person narrative (Ich-Erzählung) 21, 161
 fringe novel 21
 Fürstenspiegel 102, 103
- geographer 8, 18, 79
 gods, earthly 27, 28, 100, 162
 gods, eternal 27, 100, 106
 gods, heavenly 23, 27, 28, 47, 106, 124 n. 9, 162
 gods, immortal 41, 45, 59, 100, 124
 gods, Olympian 9, 41, 45, 47, 55, 59, 68, 99, 107, 108, 123, 124, 150, 152, 162, 164, 165
 gods, pagan 9, 24, 33, 123, 137, 149, 150, 151–153, 158, 165
 gold 75, 75 n. 25, 87, 124, 155
 golden age 19, 77, 90, 141
 gratitude 28 n. 6, 41, 48, 49, 51, 52 n. 167, 56, 58–60, 92 n. 38, 123, 127
 grave 33, 33 n. 47, 33 n. 55, 38–40, 44, 65
 gravestone 93
- heavenly bodies 68, 107
 Heraia 49
 Heraion 88 n. 11
 hero/heroes 24, 29, 30 n. 21, 31, 68, 123, 145, 152, 162
 hero cult 29–32, 43
 heurematic tradition 124
 heurematic writings 67
 historian 8, 9, 18, 27, 48, 65, 79, 84, 93 n. 39, 130, 150, 152, 165
 history of culture 21
 Hofphilosoph 3
 hymn 60, 60 n. 216, 76, 96, 97, 164
- ideal state system 103, 108, 164
 idealisation of primitive peoples 84, 84 n. 79
 impiety 67
 incense 71, 72
 incense trade route 71 n. 3
 Indian influence 81, 82 n. 62
 Indian nature 78, 78 n. 46
 Indian society 82, 82 n. 64
 Indian tribes 85, 85 n. 83
 invention 22, 105, 125, 133, 135, 136, 162
 inventor 22, 91 n. 29, 101, 124, 136, 138, 156
 island, utopian 16–18, 19, 21, 90, 97, 161, 164
 ivory 87, 87 n. 5
- kouros 37
 Kulturheroengenealogie 139
- lack of a community of women 77, 85
 lack of private ownership/property 20, 74, 83–86, 103, 163
 lawgiver 43, 84
 laws 22, 84, 84 n. 75, 94 n. 43, 125, 136, 162
 libation 41
 literary convention 18, 78, 90, 97, 161
 literary fiction 2, 8, 18, 20 n. 44, 79, 161
 literary genre 21
 Lysandrea 49
- merchants 71, 80
 mines of gold 75, 75 n. 25, 89, 155
 mines of silver 75, 75 n. 25, 89
 mixed constitution 81, 103
 money 74, 75, 80, 85
 monotheism 158, 166
 moon 27, 48, 65, 100, 127
 Munichion, month 60
 myrrh 17, 71, 71 n. 3, 72, 79, 80, 81, 86, 163
 mythology, Babylonian 155, 158, 166

- nature 17–19, 89, 90, 97, 148, 161, 164
 noble savage 84
 novel 21, 21 n. 46, 32, 90, 106, 140, 156
 novel, mythological 125–128
 novel, utopian 19–21

 Offenbarungserzählung 95
 Offenbarungsgeschichte 95 n. 54
 offerings 28, 39, 41, 92, 96, 97, 127, 135, 162
 oikumene 22, 28 n. 6, 92, 125, 135, 139, 147
 oracle 57, 92, 127, 135
 oracle, Delphic 30 n. 20, 58 n. 199
 oracles 60, 157
 origins of religion 20, 47, 68, 78, 99, 104, 106–108, 125, 133, 139, 162, 164
 ownership, collective/common 6, 80, 83, 83 n. 72, 84, 84 n. 78, 85, 85 n. 82, 85 n. 85, 86, 163
 ownership, private 86, 163

 paean 49, 61, 112
 Palaikastro hymn 37
 Parthenon 60
 Peripatetic school 99
 Peripatetics 2, 2 n. 11, 99 n. 2, 144, 145
 Philippeion 53, 53 n. 177, 54, 54 n. 178, 55
 polytheism 150, 158, 166
 prayers 57
 priest/priests 50, 59, 62, 63, 66, 73–76, 76 n. 27, 80, 81, 86, 88, 96, 96 n. 60, 96 n. 30, 97, 101 n. 17, 103, 112, 163, 164
 primitive people 84 n. 79, 85
 procession/processions 55, 59, 60, 61 n. 222
 proof for the existence of the gods 106, 107
 property, common 83 n. 72
 property, private 71, 80
 Ptolemaia/Ptolemaieia 61, 61 n. 222
 Ptolemaic Egypt/state 6, 7, 63, 81 n. 62
 Ptolemaion 60
 pyramids 22, 22 n. 58, 162
 Pythagoreans 85, 85 n. 82

 rationalism 109
 rationalistic interpretation of myths 46, 47, 68, 108, 123, 145, 162
 reinterpretation of Greek mythology 106–108, 164

 religion, pagan 39, 150, 152, 159, 166
 religious cult 89, 92
 river/rivers 18, 48, 75 n. 25, 88, 89, 126
 royal authority 124
 ruler cult 46, 48–64, 68, 100–102, 106–108, 124, 125, 162, 164

 sacred book 95
 sacrifices 41, 49, 87, 151, 164
 sanctuary 31, 32, 53, 62, 87, 88 n. 13, 89, 95, 97, 164
 Sarapeum 3, 3 n. 16, 3 n. 17, 4, 4 n. 19
 self-deification 28, 28 n. 6, 63, 68, 92, 92 n. 38, 100, 102, 124, 125, 162
 shepherds 73, 74, 77, 80, 86, 103, 163
 Sibylline Oracles 156–159, 166
 silver 75, 75 n. 25, 87, 133 n. 71
 simplicity of life 85
 slavery 77, 77 n. 37, 78 n. 38
 slaves 77, 78, 78 n. 40
 social classes 73, 73 n. 13, 74, 82, 82 n. 63–66, 86, 103, 163
 social division (stratification) 71, 74 n. 20, 75 n. 24, 86, 148, 163
 socialism 74 n. 21
 society, archaic 85, 86, 104
 society, closed 75, 86, 163
 society, Panchaeon 83, 97
 society, self-sufficient 75, 85, 86, 104, 163
 soldiers 73, 74, 84, 111, 113, 163
 sophistic movement 47, 48, 104
 Spring of the Sun 88 n. 12
 Staatsroman 20
 stars 27, 65, 91, 100, 127
 state cult 62
 statue of gods 54, 74, 87
 stele 86, 90–95, 104, 147, 163, 164
 stele, golden 21, 76 n. 28, 87, 90, 94 n. 45, 97, 162, 164
 stele, iron 94 n. 46
 stele of Heracles 93 n. 42
 stele of Hermes 94 n. 46
 Stoa/stoicism 28, 106, 129
 Stoics 129, 129 n. 47, 130, 131, 165
 sun 27, 65, 100, 127
 syncretism 6, 107, 137

 temenos 41, 59, 74, 76, 86–90, 96, 97, 163
 temple 3 n. 17, 14, 21, 31, 50, 55, 57, 60, 61, 63, 86, 87, 87 n. 3, 88, 88 n. 9, 88 n. 12, 89, 89 n. 20, 90, 92, 93, 93 n. 43, 94, 94 n. 45, 94 n. 47, 95, 96, 96

- n. 57, 97, 110, 135, 138, 139, 139 n.
 117, 147, 151, 155, 163, 164
 theogony 21, 91, 158, 162, 166
 theologoumena 64, 65, 136
 theology 101, 131, 142, 143 n. 144
 titanomachy 128, 156
 tomb of Minos 40
 tomb of Zeus 4, 5, 34–41, 68, 162
 tombs of gods 33–41, 108, 123, 143, 152,
 166, 177–181
 tombs of kings 93 n. 39
 tombstone inscription 39, 40
 trade 71, 75, 75 n. 26, 86, 163
 travel 75
 travel novel 19, 20
 travel, utopian 19, 20
 traveller's tale 19 n. 40
 trees 17, 18, 71, 78, 88, 89
 utopia sensu lato 20, 161
 utopia sensu stricto 20, 161
 utopian themes 20
 Velchania 36
 votive offerings 87
 voyage 1 n. 6, 2, 8, 9, 17, 20, 71, 83, 161
 voyage imaginaire 19 n. 40
 water source/sources 18, 88
 water spring 88
 writing, Panchaeon 90, 97, 164
 writing, Pelasgian 126

4. Greek and Latin words and expressions

A. Greek words and expressions

- ἀβασίλευτος 79, 80 n. 56, 104
 ἄγαλμα 59, 59 n. 200
 ἄδικα βιβλία 3, 10
 ἀδύνατον 36
 ἄθεος 67, 149
 ἄθεος πολυθεότης 150
 ἀθεώτατος 149
 αἰδιοὶ θεοὶ 27
 ἀναγραφή 14, 90 n. 26
 ἀνδρεῖα 84 n. 77
 ἀνδριάς 59 n. 200
 ἀντίθεος 46 n. 125
 ἄπιστα 46
 ἄτακτος βίος 22
 αὐτόνομοι καὶ ἀβασίλευτοι 80, 80 n. 56,
 104
 ἀφανισμός 127 n. 29
 ἄφθαρτοι θεοὶ 27
 ἀφιέρωσις 138 n. 108
 βασιλεία 124
 βασιλεὺς εὐεργέτης 45, 58, 124
 Βεργαῖος 6, 8
 Διὸς τάφος 40
 εἰκὼν 59 n. 200
 εἰς ἀνθρώπους εὐεργεσίας 76 n. 30, 96 n. 59
 εἰς θεοὺς μετῆλθεν 45 n. 124
 εἰς τὸ δημόσιον 74
 εἰς τὸ κοινόν 74
 ἐκθεόω 57 n. 196
 ἐπίγειοι θεοὶ 27
 εὐεργεσία 27, 123, 124, 130, 134, 150
 εὐεργέτης 22, 41, 44, 54, 68, 124, 162
 εὐρετής 22
 Ζᾶν 40, 148 n. 180
 ΖΑΝ ΚΡΟΝΟΥ 40, 93, 119
 Ζεὺς Ἄμμων 72 n. 7
 Ζεὺς Τριφύλιος 73 n. 13
 Ζεὺς Φιλίππιος 53 n. 174
 Ἥλιον ὕδαρ 88
 ἥρωικαί τιμαὶ 43, 44
 ἥρως θεός 30
 ἥρως κτίστης 43
 θανμάσια 46, 132
 θεὰ φιλάδελφος 63
 θεῖος ἀνὴρ 42 n. 111
 θεοειδής 46 n. 125
 θεοεἰκελός 46 n. 125
 θεοὶ ἀδελφοὶ 7, 39 n. 86, 62, 62 n. 226, 62
 n. 228, 68, 101, 125
 θεοὶ σωτήρες 55 n. 179, 61
 θεὸν ψηφίζεσθαι 57 n. 196
 θεός/θεῖος 42
 θεὸς καταβάτης 60
 θεὸς τρισκαίδεκατος 57

- θεωροί 56, 60
 θυμιάματα 72

 ιερά βίβλος 94
 ιερά γράμματα 91 n. 26, 95 n. 53
 ιερεὺς Ἀλεξάνδρου καὶ θεῶν ἀδελφῶν 62
 n. 226
 ιερὸς λόγος 93
 ισόθεοι τιμαί 94, 133 n. 71
 ισόθεος 45 n. 125
 ισολύμπιος 45 n. 125

 Κάσιον ὄρος 24, 24 n. 68
 καταστερισμός 24, 162
 Κιμμερίς πόλις 20

 λιβανωτός 71 n. 3
 λόγοι ἀνθρώποι 47

 Μεροπίς γῆ 20

 οὐράνιοι θεοί 91
 Οὐρανοῦ δίφρος 91

 παράδοξα 46
 πολύθεος ἀθεότης 150
 πρόνοια 129
 προσκυνεῖν 53
 προσκύνησις 57
 πρῶτος εὐρετής 101, 138

 σμύρνα 71 n. 3
 σύνθρονος τοῖς δώδεκα θεοῖς 55 n. 182
 σύννοιοι θεοί 46
 συσσίτια 84, 84 n. 77
 σωτήρ 41, 58, 61, 68, 112, 124, 162
 σωτήρ καὶ θεός 51
 σωτήρες 41, 46

 Τριφυλία 87 n. 1
 Τριφύλιος 73
 τυχεῖν ἀθανάτων τιμῶν 134 n. 80

 φιδίτια 84 n. 77
 φίλος 1

 χαλκεῖα μεγάλα 88

B. Latin expressions

- ars meretricia 124 n. 9
 constitutio mixta 81, 103
 dei certi 130
 dei sempiterni 130
 deos homines fuisse 130, 150, 152, 165, 171
 deus/divus/divinus 42
 euhemerismus inversus 123 n. 7, 150
 homines pro diis culti 130, 150, 152, 165, 167
 index deorum cognominum 142–144, 165
 immortales ex hominibus facti 131
 locus amoenus 18, 19, 78, 90, 97, 126,
 159, 161, 164
 mortalis deus 45 n. 124
 res gestae 20, 146, 147, 163
 theologia civilis 129
 theologia dipertita 27, 28, 66, 81 n. 61,
 100, 130, 134, 138, 162
 theologia fabulosa 129
 theologia mythica 129
 theologia politica 129
 theologia tripartita 129 n. 47
 translatio artium 153

5. Index of passages

- Achil. Tat. Leucip. et Clitoph. III 6 24 n. 68
 Acta Acacii 2 p. 58 Knopf-Krüger 38
 n. 82, 180
 Acta Apollonii 22 p. 32 Knopf-Krüger 38
 n. 82, 173, 179
 Acta S. Sebastiani 12, 40–41
 (PL 17, 1038 D–1039 B) 175
 Acusil. FGrHist 2 F 18 = fr. 18 Fowler 33
 n. 52
 Ado Viennen. Chronicon (PL 123, 23–
 138) 153
 Ael. Nat. anim. II 21 128 n. 41
 XII 30 24 n. 68
 XVI 39 78 n. 46

- XVII 2 78 n. 46
 XVII 22 78 n. 46
 XVII 23 78 n. 46
 XVII 25 78 n. 46
 Ael. Var. hist. II 19 56 n. 187, 57 n. 196
 II 26 43 n. 113
 II 31 5 n. 28, 10 n. 57
 V 12 56 n. 189, 57 n. 195
 XII 45 128 n. 41
 XII 59 42 n. 109
 Ael. fr. 86 Hercher = fr. 89 Domingo-Fo-
 rasté 52 n. 165
 Ael. Aristid. Or. 1, 50–51 Lenz 30 n. 20
 1, 374 Lenz 168, 173
 9, 14 Lenz 53 n. 172, 55 n. 184
 11, 65 Lenz 30 n. 20
 38, 21 Keil 168, 173
 Aesch. Suppl. 980–983 41
 Aëtius. Plac. I 6, 1 p. 292–293 Diels 129
 n. 46
 I 6, 15 p. 296–297 Diels 130 n. 49,
 130 n. 52, 168, 172
 I 7, 1 p. 297–298 Diels 3 n. 14, 6
 n. 34, 10 n. 57
 I 7, 2 p. 298 Diels 47 n. 135, 100 n. 6
 Agath. Hist. II 24, 8 32 n. 42, 92 n. 35
 Agatharch. De mari Erythr. 100 (GGM I
 189) 76 n. 32
 Alcman, PMG fr. 98 84 n. 77
 Alexander Polyhist. FGrHist 273 F 19 157
 n. 242
 Alexis, Hesione, fr. 90 Kassel-Austin
 (PCG II 67) 6 n. 38
 Ps.-Ambros. Quaest. Vet. et Novi Test.
 114, 1 (CSEL 50, 303) 174
 114, 29 (CSEL 50, 316) 174
 Ammian. Marc. Res gest. XXII 14, 4 24
 n. 68
 Ampel. Lib. mem. 9, 1–12 143 n. 138
 Anth. Lat. 432 Riese = 430 Shackleton
 Bailey 38 n. 81, 180
 Anth. Pal. VI 332 24 n. 68
 VII 275, 6 38 n. 81, 179
 VII 746 38 n. 81, 40 n. 97, 180
 Antip. Tars. SVF III 33 42 n. 108
 Antiphanes Tritagonistes, fr. 207 Kassel-
 Austin (PCG II 434) 42 n. 111
 Apollod. Athen. FGrHist 244 F 104 134
 n. 75
 F 157 a 2 n. 8, 8 n. 50, 20 n. 42, 79 n. 48
 Ps.-Apollod. Bibl. III 2, 1 24 n. 68
 Apollon. Rhod. Argon. IV 869–879 29
 n. 10
 III 13, 6 29 n. 10
 Appian. Hist. Rom. (Hisp.) 23 110 n. 6
 Hist. Rom. (Mithrid.) 26 24 n. 68
 Apul. De deo Socr. 15, 153 173
 15, 153–154 168
 Apul. De mundo 35 122 n. 74
 Ps.-Apul. Asclep. 37 (Corp. Herm. II 347
 Nock) 179
 Aret. Isid. 2 p. 1 Totti 94 n. 44
 3c p. 1 91 n. 29
 4 p. 2 22 n. 51
 21 p. 2 22 n. 50
 Arist. De caelo I 9, 279 a sqq. 107 n. 60
 II 3, 286 a 9 107 n. 60
 Arist. De Pythag. fr. 1 B 130 Ross = fr.
 173 Gigon 43 n. 113
 fr. 1 D p. 131 Ross 43 n. 113
 fr. 1 E p. 131 Ross 43 n. 113
 fr. 2 p. 132 Ross = fr. 156 Gigon 43
 n. 113
 Arist. Eth. Nic. VII 1, 1145 a 23–24 43
 n. 112
 IX, 1162 a 5–6 42 n. 108
 Arist. Metaph. XII, 1074 a 30–31 107
 n. 60
 Arist. Polit. II, 1263 a 3–8 83 n. 72
 II, 1267 b 31–33 82 n. 65
 II, 1271 b 22–23 84 n. 75
 II, 1272 a 12–21 84 n. 77
 III, 1284 a 11 42 n. 111
 Arist. Protr. fr. 10 c p. 42 Ross = fr. 832
 Gigon 45 n. 124
 Arist. Rhet. II 23, 1400 b 5 sqq. 151
 n. 208
 Ps.-Arist. Ep. 4 p. 31 Plezia 42 n. 109
 Aristeeas, Ep. ad Philocr. 135–137 171
 Aristob. FGrHist 139 F 51 93 n. 39
 Arnob. Adv. nat. I 37–38 174
 I 38 169
 I 41 169, 174
 II 74 169, 174
 III 39 169, 174
 IV 14 38 n. 82, 143 n. 144, 180
 IV 14–15 143 n. 138
 IV 25 38 n. 82, 178, 180
 IV 29 6 n. 31, 10 n. 57, 66 n. 50, 67
 n. 257, 131 n. 61, 132 n. 66, 149
 n. 189, 150 n. 197, 171, 174
 V 30 174
 VI 6 151 n. 206, 151 n. 207, 174
 VII 27 122 n. 74
 Arrian. Anab. II 16, 5 46 n. 130
 III 4, 2 88 n. 11
 IV 11, 7 30 n. 20
 VI 29, 4–8 93 n. 39

- VII 20, 2 71 n. 3
 VII 23, 2 56 n. 192
 Arrian. Ind. 5, 4 33 n. 46
 6, 8 78 n. 46
 7, 5 sqq. 22 n. 51
 7, 8 145 n. 161
 7–8 33 n. 46
 8, 13 75 n. 25
 11, 1 – 12, 9 82 n. 64
 11, 7 78 n. 46
 15, 1 78 n. 46
 15, 4 78 n. 46
 15, 8 78 n. 46
 15, 10 78 n. 46
 Artapanus, FGrHist 726 F 3 156 n. 236
 Athanas. Or. c. gent. 9 174
 12 170, 174
 16 174
 Athen. Dipnosoph. IV 19, 141 AB 84 n. 77
 IV 22, 143 AD 84 n. 77
 IV 22, 143 EF 84 n. 77
 V 27–36, 197 C – 203 B 61 n. 222
 V 32, 202 D 61 n. 224
 V 40, 207 E 87 n. 5
 VI 58, 251 B 56 n. 189
 VI 63, 253 DF 60 n. 216
 VII 33, 289 C 52 n. 169
 VIII 37, 346 D 132 n. 63
 XIV 3, 614 DE 53 n. 176
 XIV 77, 658 E 6 n. 35, 13 n. 1
 XIV 77, 658 EF 23 n. 61, 24 n. 72, 100 n. 12
 XV 52, 696 E 49 n. 144
 XV 52, 696 F – 697 A 61 n. 219
 Athenag. Leg. pro Chr. 28, 1 67 n. 251, 132 n. 61
 28, 4 134 n. 75, 151 n. 207, 173
 29, 1–2 151 n. 203, 168
 30, 1 157 n. 242
 30, 2 38 n. 82, 179
 Aug. De civ. Dei IV 27 167, 175
 VI 5 129 n. 47
 VI 7 9 n. 55, 121 n. 72, 150 n. 197, 175
 VI 12 129 n. 47
 VII 27 9 n. 55, 121 n. 72, 150 n. 197, 175
 VIII 5 67 n. 252, 131 n. 61, 167, 171, 175
 VIII 12 175
 VIII 26 151 n. 206, 175, 179
 VIII 27 67 n. 252, 132 n. 61, 171, 175
 XII 11 67 n. 252, 91 n. 26
 XVIII 5 175
 XVIII 14 170, 175
 XXI 5 88 n. 11
 XXII 4 175
 Aug. De cons. evang. I 23, 32 9 n. 55, 121 n. 72, 150 n. 197, 175
 I 23, 34 175
 Aug. De vera rel. 108 (CCL 32, 256) 151 n. 206, 175
 Aug. Ep. 17, 1 (CSEL 34, 43) 121 n. 72
 17, 3 9 n. 55, 150 n. 197, 175
 Aug. Sermo 273, 3 (PL 38, 1249) 175
 Baton, FGrHist 268 F 2 52 n. 169
 Berossus, FGrHist 680 F 12 32 n. 42, 92 n. 35
 Caec. Stat. fr. 264 Ribbeck³ 41 n. 107
 Caesar, Bell. Gall. IV 1 85 n. 85
 IV 24, 1 84 n. 73
 V 16, 2 84 n. 73
 Ps.-Caesar. Naz. Erotapokriseis 111 p. 91
 Riedinger 38 n. 82, 170, 175, 177–180
 Callim. Hymn. Iov. 8–9 3 n. 13, 38 n. 81, 179
 Callim. Iamb. 1, 9–11 (fr. 191 Pfeiffer = fr. 151 Asper) 3, 3 n. 13, 107 n. 58
 1, 10 93 n. 39
 1, 11 10 n. 60
 12, 16–17 (fr. 202 Pfeiffer = fr. 163 Asper) 38 n. 81, 179
 Callim. fr. 228 Pfeiffer = fr. 122 Asper 45 n. 124
 fr. 643 Pfeiffer = fr. 424 Asper 178
 Ps.-Callisth. Hist. Alex. M. I 33, 13 3 n. 16
 Callixinus, FGrHist 627 F 2 61 n. 222, 61 n. 224
 Cass. Dio, Hist. Rom. XVI fr. 57, 39 110 n. 5
 XVI fr. 57, 48 111 n. 13
 LXXVIII 8 92 n. 35
 Cassiodor. Var. IV 34, 3 124 n. 9
 Castor, FGrHist 250 F 1 134 n. 79
 Cedren. Hist. comp. 29 (PG 121, 56 C) 38 n. 83, 181
 30 (PG 121, 57 B) 177
 31 (PG 121, 57 D) 38 n. 83, 40 n. 97, 181
 43 (PG 121, 72 A) 178
 Cephalion FGrHist 93 F 4 178
 Cert. Hom. et Hes. 8 p. 328 West 35 n. 68, 38 n. 81, 180

- Charax FGrHist 103 F 13 43 n. 114
 Chron. Pasch. 38 (PG 92, 149 B) 177
 44 (PG 92, 164 BC) 38 n. 82, 40
 n. 97, 180
 44–45 (PG 92, 164 B – 165 B) 154
 n. 221
 Chrysippus, SVF II 300 129 n. 46
 II 1009 129 n. 46, 172
 II 1021 129 n. 46
 II 1025 129 n. 46
 II 1076 171
 II 1077 171
 II 1115 42 n. 108
 Cic. Ad Atticum IV 16, 3 43 n. 113
 Cic. Consol. fr. 11 Müller 167, 172
 Cic. Cum pop. grat. egit 11 41 n. 107
 Cic. Cum sen. grat. egit 8 41 n. 107
 Cic. De div. I 48 94 n. 45
 Cic. De fin. II 40 45 n. 124
 Cic. De leg. II 19 131 n. 56, 167, 171
 II 27 172
 Cic. De nat. deor. I 38 48 n. 142, 107
 n. 57, 130 n. 50, 172
 I 39 171
 I 118 48 n. 141, 100 n. 6
 I 118–119 10 n. 57, 120
 I 119 101 n. 17, 119, 172
 II 32 43 n. 113
 II 60 42 n. 108
 II 62 130 n. 53, 167, 172
 III 39 167, 172
 III 42 128 n. 41, 143 n. 137, 143 n. 144
 III 45 167, 172
 III 53 38 n. 81, 40 n. 99, 143 n. 141,
 143 n. 142, 179
 III 53–60 142, 143
 III 56 91 n. 29
 III 57 143 n. 142, 177
 III 58 143 n. 141
 III 60 143 n. 137
 Cic. De orat. I 106 43 n. 113
 II 51 116 n. 40
 II 53 116 n. 40
 II 179 43 n. 113
 Cic. De rep. III 40 172
 VI, fr. 6 Ziegler 110 n. 6
 Cic. Pro Lig. 38 42 n. 109
 Cic. Pro Sestio 144 41 n. 107
 Cic. Tusc. disp. I 28 167, 172
 I 48 43 n. 113
 Claudianus, De raptu Pros. 81 121 n. 74
 Claudianus, De nupt. Honor. 94 121 n. 74
 Claudianus, De tertio cons. Honor. 211 121
 n. 74
 Clearchus, De somno fr. 6 Wehrli 23 n. 60
 Clem. Alex. Protr. II, 18, 2 178
 II 23, 1 149 n. 190
 II 24, 2 6 n. 31, 10 n. 57, 132 n. 67,
 133, 149 n. 189, 150 n. 195
 II 26, 7 169
 II 28, 1 – 29, 1 143 n. 138
 II 37, 4 38 n. 82, 180
 II 24, 3 151 n. 208
 II 30, 1–5 169
 II 30, 3 177, 178
 III 44, 4 151 n. 207, 173
 III 45, 5 173
 IV 49, 3 22 n. 58, 151 n. 207, 173
 IV 54, 4 52 n. 169
 IV 54, 5 53 n. 175
 IV 54, 6 60 n. 210
 IV 55, 2 151 n. 206
 VI 68, 5 48 n. 139, 100 n. 65
 X 91, 1 173
 Clem. Alex. Strom. I 15, 72, 5 23 n. 60
 I 21, 105, 1–3 169, 173
 I 21, 106 66 n. 250
 Ps.-Clem. Rom. Ep. II ad Cor. 3, 1 151
 n. 206, 173
 Ps.-Clem. Rom. Hom. V 23 174
 V 23, 1 178
 V 23, 2 38 n. 82, 180
 V 23, 3 177, 178, 179
 VI 21, 1 178
 VI 21, 2 38 n. 82, 180
 VI 21, 3 177, 178, 179
 VI 22 174
 VI 22, 2 170
 X 9 174
 Ps.-Clem. Rom. Recogn. IV 30 174
 X 23, 4 38 n. 82
 X 24, 2 177–179
 X 25 174
 X 25, 2 170
 Clitarchus, FGrHist 137 F 17 a 33 n. 46
 F 18 78 n. 46
 F 19 78 n. 46
 F 20 78 n. 46
 F 21 78 n. 46
 F 22 78 n. 46
 Colum. Res rust. IX 2–4 10 n. 63
 Commenta Bern. ad Lucan. V 60 68
 n. 259
 VIII 607 68 n. 259
 VIII 872 38 n. 83, 40 n. 95, 93 n. 39,
 181
 Commod. Instr. I 6 174
 I 6, 16 38 n. 82, 180

- Cosmas Hier. Hist. ad carm. Greg. Naz.
263 (PG 38, 504) 38 n. 83, 181
- Cosmas Ind. Top. Chr. II 58–63 (SCH 141,
370–379) 95 n. 50
- Critias DK B 25 = TrGF 43 F 19 47
n. 135, 100 n. 6, 105 n. 41
- Ctesias, FGrHist 688 F 1 b 32 n. 42, 92
n. 35
F 45 § 26 75 n. 25
- Curt. Ruf. Hist. Alex. IV 7, 22 88 n. 11,
88 n. 12
VIII 5, 8 169, 173
X 1, 14 93 n. 39
- Cypr. Quod idola 1–3 174
2 38 n. 82, 169, 180
3 67 n. 251
- Cyr. Al. C. Iul. X 342 (PG 76, 1025
D) 178
X 342 (PG 76, 1028 A) 177
X 342 (PG 76, 1028 B) 38 n. 82, 40
n. 97, 180
- Cyranides 1 p. 14–18 Kaimakis 94 n. 46
- Damasc. Dubit. et solut. 282 128 n. 41
- Damasc. In Plat. Phileb. 227 p. 107 Wes-
terink 43 n. 113
- Ps.-Demetr. De elocut. 66
- Democrit. DK 68 A 33 91 n. 26
A 75 48 n. 139, 100 n. 6
B 5 105 n. 45
B 30 48 n. 139, 100 n. 6
B 166 47 n. 138, 100 n. 6
B 175 42 n. 108
B 299 e 128 n. 41
- Demosth. Or. 16, 16 87 n. 1
- Ps.-Demosth. Or. 25, 15 105 n. 45
- De viris illustr. 49 110 n. 4
- Dicaearchus fr. 49 Wehrli = fr. 56 A
Mirhady 85 n. 81
fr. 72 Wehrli = fr. 87 Mirhady 84
n. 77
- Diagoras Mel. T 68 Winiarczyk 128
n. 41
T 93 128 n. 41
T 94 128 n. 41
T 95 128 n. 41
T 97 128 n. 41
T 98 128 n. 41
- Didache 6, 3 173
- Dinarchus, C. Dem. 1, 94 57 n. 197
- Dinarchus, FGrHist 399 F 1 a 34 n. 58,
128 n. 39
F 1 b 34 n. 58, 128 n. 39, 178
- Ps.-Dio Chrys. Or. 37, 21 50 n. 154
- Diodor. Bibl. hist. I 2, 4 172
I 8, 1 105 n. 45
I 11–29 64, 136
I 12, 10–13, 1 27 n. 3
I 13, 1 64, 131 n. 56, 172
I 13, 2 24 n. 67
I 14, 1 22 n. 50, 135
I 14, 1–15, 8 135 n. 82
I 15, 3 135, 172
I 15, 8 135
I 15, 9–16, 2 22 n. 52, 135
I 16, 1 91 n. 29, 135 n. 89
I 17, 1–20, 5 135 n. 82
I 17, 2 135 n. 84
I 18, 5 172
I 20, 1 95 n. 50
I 20, 5 135 n. 85, 172
I 20, 6 135 n. 86, 172
I 21, 1–22, 7 135
I 21, 6 135 n. 87
I 22, 1 172
I 22, 2 135 n. 88, 172
I 24, 7 172
I 25, 7 135 n. 90
I 27, 4 95 n. 56
I 28, 5 82 n. 66
I 46, 8–49, 5 65 n. 243
I 55, 7 91 n. 26, 95 n. 50
I 73, 2–74, 7 82 n. 63
I 74, 1 82 n. 66
I 74, 6 74 n. 19
I 90, 3 172
II 8, 7 32 n. 42, 92 n. 35
II 9, 4 32 n. 42, 92 n. 35
II 29, 4 74 n. 19
II 38, 3–6 136
II 38, 5 136 n. 93, 172
II 38–39 145 n. 159
II 39, 1–4 136
II 39, 4 136 n. 94, 172
II 40, 1–41, 5 82 n. 64
II 47 16 n. 26
II 47, 2 90 n. 21
II 55–60 16 n. 27, 20
II 56, 7–57, 3 90 n. 22
II 57, 3 88 n. 11
II 57, 4 77 n. 36
II 58, 1 77
II 58, 2–5 78 n. 43
III 9, 1 27 n. 3, 131 n. 56, 172
III 46, 3 71 n. 3, 76 n. 33
III 47, 4 76 n. 32
III 52–55 126 n. 18
III 53, 4–5 126 n. 22

- III 53, 4–6 16 n. 27
 III 56–57 126 n. 18
 III 56, 3 22 n. 51
 III 56, 5 23 n. 67, 126 n. 26, 171
 III 57, 2 126 n. 27, 171
 III 57, 5 24 n. 67, 127 n. 28
 III 57, 8 127 n. 30, 171
 III 60 126 n. 18
 III 60, 3 24 n. 67, 127 n. 31, 171
 III 60, 5 127 n. 32, 171
 III 61, 1–3 126 n. 18
 III 61, 2 38 n. 81, 39 n. 87, 179
 III 61, 4–6 126 n. 18
 III 63, 4 172
 III 66 – 74, 1 126 n. 18
 III 67, 4 126 n. 20
 III 67, 5 126 n. 21
 III 68, 5 88 n. 11, 126 n. 23
 III 68, 5 – 69, 4 16 n. 27
 III 69, 1 88 n. 11
 III 71, 5 127 n. 33, 171
 III 72, 1 127 n. 34, 171
 III 73, 1 127 n. 35, 171
 III 73, 3 127 n. 36, 171
 III 73, 5 127 n. 37, 171
 III 73, 8 127 n. 38, 171
 III 74, 2 95 n. 50
 IV 1, 4 172
 IV 1, 7 172
 IV 3, 2 136, 172
 IV 3, 5 172
 IV 18, 4 95 n. 50
 IV 38–39 136
 IV 38, 5 172
 IV 39, 1 30 n. 20, 172
 IV 40–55 126 n. 18
 IV 48 136
 IV 48, 6 167, 172
 IV 62, 4 172
 IV 81–82 136
 IV 81, 3 136 n. 95, 172
 IV 81, 5 136 n. 95
 IV 81, 6 136 n. 95
 IV 82, 5 172
 IV 82, 6 172
 IV 85, 5 172
 V 9, 4–5 85 n. 84
 V 21, 2 172
 V 21, 5 83 n. 73
 V 34, 3 85 n. 85
 V 41 – 46 9, 13, 161
 V 41, 2–3 2 n. 10
 V 41, 4 71 n. 1, 73 n. 13, 80
 V 41, 4 – 42, 2 71 n. 2
 V 41, 6 72, 77
 V 42, 1 71, 80
 V 42, 2 71, 80
 V 42, 3 17 n. 31, 79 n. 47
 V 42, 4 72 n. 6
 V 42, 5 73 n. 13, 76 n. 27, 77 n. 34,
 96 n. 60, 104 n. 36
 V 42, 6 87 n. 1, 87 n. 3
 V 42, 6–44, 5 87 n. 3
 V 43, 1–3 78 n. 41
 V 43, 2 78 n. 42, 78 n. 44, 88 n. 11
 V 44, 1 87 n. 4, 87 n. 6
 V 44, 2–3 88 n. 10
 V 44, 3 78 n. 44, 89 n. 14
 V 44, 3–4 88 n. 13
 V 44, 4 89 n. 16
 V 44, 5 76 n. 31, 80
 V 44, 6 73 n. 9, 73 n. 13, 106 n. 49
 V 44, 6–7 22 n. 58
 V 44, 7 72 n. 8
 V 45, 1 74 n. 17, 78 n. 43
 V 45, 2 73 n. 12, 73 n. 13
 V 45, 2 – 46, 4 103 n. 27
 V 45, 3 73 n. 13, 74 n. 17, 83 n. 73
 V 45, 4 76 n. 27, 80
 V 45, 4–5 75 n. 24, 80, 96 n. 60
 V 45, 5 74 n. 21, 76 n. 27, 80
 V 45, 6 76 n. 29, 95 n. 62
 V 46, 1 104 n. 37
 V 46, 2 76 n. 30, 96 n. 59, 96 n. 62,
 101 n. 17
 V 46, 3 76 n. 28, 76 n. 33, 90 n. 26, 91
 n. 27, 95 n. 50, 96 n. 57
 V 46, 4 75 n. 25, 76 n. 32, 86 n. 89,
 89 n. 15
 V 46, 5 87 n. 7
 V 46, 5–7 87 n. 3
 V 46, 6 87 n. 5
 V 46, 7 86 n. 90, 90 n. 26, 91 n. 27,
 147 n. 172
 V 55, 7 172
 V 59, 2 24 n. 68
 V 64 – 80 136, 136 n. 90
 V 64, 2 172
 V 64, 6 136 n. 96, 172
 V 66, 3 172
 V 66, 4 22 n. 51
 V 67, 5 172
 V 68, 1 172
 V 68, 3 172
 V 70, 1 136 n. 96
 V 71, 5 172
 V 71, 6 172
 V 72, 1 172

- V 74, 3 172
 V 79, 2 172
 V 79, 4 172
 V 83, 3 172
 VI 1 9, 13, 150, 161
 VI 1, 1 5 n. 28, 100 n. 7
 VI 1, 1–2 27 n. 1, 81 n. 61, 131 n. 56, 162
 VI 1, 2 167, 172
 VI 1, 3 9
 VI 1, 4 1 n. 5, 74 n. 16
 VI 1, 4–5 71 n. 1
 VI 1, 5 87 n. 2, 87 n. 7
 VI 1, 6 87 n. 1
 VI 1, 6–7 87 n. 3, 147 n. 172
 VI 1, 7 90 n. 26
 VI 1, 8 23 n. 67, 91 n. 32, 101 n. 17, 124 n. 9
 VI 1, 8–9 27
 VI 1, 10 22 n. 56, 22 n. 57, 24 n. 68, 92 n. 35
 VI 1, 11 172
 VI 2, 1 172
 VI 6, 1 172
 VII 5, 2 172
 XII 58, 7 71 n. 1
 XV 81, 5 52 n. 164
 XVI 18–20 51 n. 159
 XVI 20, 6 44 n. 119, 51 n. 161
 XVI 92, 5 55 n. 181
 XVII 50, 3–4 88 n. 11, 88 n. 12
 XVIII 4, 1 45 n. 124
 XVIII 8 56 n. 188
 XVIII 56, 2 45 n. 124
 XIX 105, 1 59 n. 201
 XX 46, 2 59 n. 204, 59 n. 207
 XX 100, 3–4 60 n. 217
 XX 102, 3 44 n. 120
 XL 3 23 n. 60
 Diogen. Prov. II 67 (CPG I 207) 24 n. 71
 Diog. Laert. I 10 64 n. 236
 I 10–11 65 n. 244
 VI 63 57 n. 194
 VII 134 129 n. 46
 VII 147 129 n. 46
 VIII 11 43 n. 113
 VIII 41 43 n. 113
 VIII 62 43 n. 113
 VIII 68 43 n. 113
 VIII 70 43 n. 113
 IX 49 91 n. 26
 X 5 43 n. 114
 X 135 43 n. 113
 Diog. Sinop. SSR V B 36 57 n. 194
 Dion. Hal. Ant. Rom. II 23, 3 84 n. 75
 II 62, 5 42 n. 108
 VII 72, 13 168, 172
 Dion. Per. Orb. descr. 409 (GGM II 128) 87 n. 1
 Dion. Scyt. fr. 2 Rusten 16 n. 27, 126 n. 18
 fr. 3 16 n. 27, 126 n. 18
 fr. 4 126 n. 18
 fr. 5 126 n. 18
 fr. 6 22 n. 51, 23 n. 67, 126 n. 18, 126 n. 26, 126 n. 27, 127 n. 28, 127 n. 30, 171
 fr. 7 126 n. 18, 127 n. 31, 127 n. 32, 171
 fr. 8 16 n. 27, 88 n. 11, 126 n. 18, 126 n. 20, 126 n. 21, 126 n. 22, 126 n. 23
 fr. 9 126 n. 18
 fr. 10 126 n. 18, 127 n. 33, 127 n. 34, 171
 fr. 11 126 n. 18
 fr. 12 126 n. 18, 127 n. 35, 127 n. 36, 128 n. 37, 128 n. 38, 171
 fr. 13 38 n. 81, 39 n. 87, 126 n. 18, 179
 Dioscur. De mat. med. I 92 72 n. 4
 Dosiades, FGrHist 458 F 2 84 n. 77
 Ps.-Dositheus, in Corp. Gloss. Lat. ed. G. Goetz, III, 386–387 94 n. 45
 Duris, FGrHist 76 F 13 46 n. 127, 60 n. 216
 F 26 49 n. 144
 F 71 49 n. 144
 Empedocles, DK 31 B 112 = fr. 1 Inwood 43 n. 113
 Ennius, Epigr. fr. 4 Vahlen 112 n. 19
 Ennius, Euhem. fr. 1 Vahlen 117
 fr. 3 117
 fr. 4 117
 fr. 5 117
 fr. 6 117
 fr. 7 117
 fr. 8 117
 fr. 9 117
 fr. 10 117
 fr. 11 117, 179
 fr. 12 38 n. 81
 fr. 13 119 n. 57
 Ennius, Scaenica fr. 316–318 Vahlen = fr. CXXXIV Jocelyn 109 n. 1
 Ennius, Varia 9–14 Vahlen 112 n. 20
 Ep. ad Diogn. 10, 6 42 n. 110

- Ephorus, FGrHist 70 F 42 85 n. 83
 F 148 84 n. 76
 F 149 84 n. 75, 84 n. 77
- Epicurus, Περὶ φύσεως XII fr. 87 Usener
 = fr. 27, 2 Arrighetti² 107 n. 56
- Epimenid. FGrHist 457 F 2 = DK 3 B 1 =
 41 F Bernabé 34 n. 61
- Epiph. Anc. 104, 1 (I 124 Holl) 151 n. 208
 106 (I 128 Holl) 38 n. 82, 180
- Epiph. Panar. 42, 12 (II 169 Holl) 38
 n. 82, 180
- Eratosthenes, fr. I B 6 Berger 8 n. 48, 79
 n. 48
 fr. I B 7 2 n. 8, 6 n. 37, 8 n. 48, 79
 n. 48
 fr. III B 48 71 n. 3
- Etym. Magn. s.v. Βροτός 5 n. 28, 21 n. 49
 Δελοφοί 178
 Δίκτη 36 n. 74
- Ps.-Eudocia, Viol. 414 pp. 311–312
 Flach 38 n. 83, 40 n. 97, 181
- Euhem. T 1 A Winiarczyk 3, 7, 10 n. 60,
 93 n. 39, 107 n. 58
 T 1 B 3 n. 14, 10 n. 57
 T 1 C 3 n. 14, 5 n. 28, 10 n. 57
 T 2 3, 5, 7
 T 3 1 n. 5, 7, 71 n. 1, 74 n. 16, 79
 n. 52, 87 n. 2, 87 n. 7
 T 4 2 n. 8, 6 n. 37, 8 n. 48, 79 n. 48
 T 5 2 n. 8, 5 n. 28, 8 n. 48, 8 n. 51,
 79 n. 48
 T 6 2 n. 8, 8 n. 50, 20 n. 42, 79 n. 48
 T 7 A 2 n. 8, 10 n. 57, 79 n. 48
 T 7 B 10 n. 57, 79 n. 48
 T 8 9
 T 9 9 n. 55, 23 n. 58, 150 n. 197
 T 10 5 n. 28, 9 n. 55, 115
 T 11 9 n. 55, 121 n. 72, 150 n. 197
 T 12 9 n. 55, 121 n. 72, 150 n. 197
 T 13 9 n. 55, 121 n. 72, 150 n. 197
 T 14 10 n. 57, 101 n. 17, 119, 120
 T 15 2 n. 8, 5 n. 28, 9 n. 54, 10 n. 57,
 67 n. 253, 79 n. 48, 90 n. 26
 T 16 3 n. 14, 6 n. 34, 10 n. 57, 149
 n. 187
 T 17 A 6 n. 34, 10 n. 57, 149 n. 187
 T 17 B 6 n. 34, 10 n. 57, 149 n. 187
 T 18 6 n. 34, 10 n. 57
 T 19 10 n. 57, 149 n. 183
 T 20 6 n. 31, 10 n. 57, 149 n. 189
 T 21 6 n. 31, 10 n. 57, 149 n. 189, 150
 n. 197
 T 22 A 5 n. 28, 10 n. 57
 T 22 B 5 n. 28, 10 n. 57
- T 23 10 n. 57
 T 24 10 n. 63, 115
 T 25 5 n. 28, 27 n. 1, 81 n. 61, 100
 n. 7, 131 n. 56, 162
 T 27 10 n. 57, 22 n. 50, 105 n. 41
 T 29 2 n. 10, 23 n. 59
 T 30 71 n. 1, 71 n. 2, 73 n. 13, 77
 T 31 17 n. 31, 79 n. 47
 T 32 B 87 n. 1
 T 33 72 n. 6, 73 n. 13, 76 n. 27, 77 n.
 34, 96 n. 60, 104 n. 36
 T 34 22 n. 58, 72 n. 8, 73 n. 9, 73
 n. 13, 106 n. 49
 T 35 73 n. 12, 73 n. 13, 74 n. 17, 74 n.
 21, 75 n. 24, 75 n. 25, 76 n. 27, 76
 n. 28, 76 n. 29, 76 n. 30, 76 n. 32,
 76 n. 33, 83 n. 73, 86 n. 89, 89
 n. 15, 90 n. 26, 95 n. 50, 96 n. 57, 96
 n. 60, 96 n. 62, 101 n. 17, 104 n. 37
 T 36 87 n. 1, 87 n. 3, 90 n. 26, 147
 n. 172
 T 37 76 n. 28, 86 n. 90, 87 n. 3, 87
 n. 5, 87 n. 7, 90 n. 26, 91 n. 27, 91
 n. 28, 147 n. 172
 T 38 76 n. 31, 78 n. 41, 78 n. 42, 78
 n. 44, 87 n. 1, 87 n. 3, 87 n. 4, 87
 n. 6, 88 n. 13, 89 n. 14
 T 39 78 n. 43
 T 40 121 n. 74
 T 41 A 121 n. 74
 T 41 B 121 n. 74
 T 41 C 121 n. 74
 T 42 121 n. 74
 T 43 A 121 n. 74
 T 43 B 121 n. 74
 T 44 122 n. 74
 T 45 122 n. 74
 T 46 121 n. 74
 T 47 A 121 n. 74
 T 47 B 121 n. 74
 T 47 C 121 n. 74
 T 48 122 n. 74
 T 49 23 n. 67, 27, 91 n. 32, 101 n. 17,
 119, 124 n. 9
 T 51 A 114
 T 51 B 114
 T 52 179
 T 54 114, 115, 119, 156
 T 56 23 n. 63
 T 57 114
 T 58 118, 141 n. 125
 T 59 114, 121 n. 72
 T 61 22 n. 56, 92 n. 35
 T 62 23 n. 67, 114, 119

- T 63 22 n. 57, 24 n. 68
 T 64 A 23 n. 62, 24 n. 68, 28 n. 6, 32
 n. 41, 92 n. 36, 92 n. 38, 114, 119
 n. 52, 147 n. 173, 147 n. 174
 T 64 B 114
 T 65 5 n. 28, 9 n. 55, 87 n. 1, 90 n. 26,
 147 n. 172
 T 66 22 n. 50, 28 n. 6, 92 n. 38, 101
 n. 17, 114, 124 n. 9
 T 67 22 n. 52, 28 n. 6, 76 n. 28, 92
 n. 38, 101 n. 17
 T 68 23 n. 65, 24 n. 70
 T 69 A 22 n. 51, 22 n. 55, 23 n. 63,
 28 n. 6, 38 n. 81, 39, 40, 40 n. 95,
 76 n. 28, 93 n. 38, 101 n. 17, 114,
 119, 124, n. 9, 147 n. 175, 179
 T 69 B 38 n. 81, 39, 101 n. 17, 119,
 124 n. 9, 179
 T 73 120 n. 63
 T 74 22 n. 53, 23 n. 66, 124 n. 9
 T 75 A 14 n. 6, 22 n. 53, 23 n. 64, 114,
 124 n. 9
 T 75 B 14 n. 6, 124 n. 9
 T 76 24 n. 71
 T 77 6 n. 35, 13 n. 1, 23 n. 61, 24
 n. 72, 100 n. 12, 119
 T 78 5 n. 28
 T 79 A 23 n. 60
 T 80 22 n. 58, 120
 T 81 89 n. 15, 124 n. 9
 T 82 A 89 n. 15, 124 n. 9
 T 82 B 124 n. 9
 T 83 119, 119 n. 57, 142
 T 84 120
 T 91 121 n. 70, 151
 T 93 14 n. 7, 121 n. 70, 151
 T 94 9 n. 55, 150 n. 197
 Euphorio, fr. 13 Powell = fr. 14 van Gron-
 ingen 178
 Eupolemus, FGrHist 723 F 2 b 155 n. 226
 Eupolis, fr. 384 Kassel-Austin (PCG V
 509) 41 n. 106
 Eur. Bacch. 13–19 32
 Ps.–Eur. Rhesus 355–358 41
 Eus. Arm. Chron. p. 12 ed. Karst (GCS 20)
 157 n. 242
 p. 26 134 n. 79
 p. 168 178
 Eus. Hier. Chron. p. 54 b Helm 34 n. 58,
 178
 Eus. Praep. ev. I 9, 20–10, 53 137 n. 103
 I 9, 21 138 n. 105
 I 9, 23 137 n. 102
 I 9, 24 138 n. 105, 138 n. 106
 I 9, 26 94 n. 47
 I 9, 29 131 n. 56, 138 n. 111, 172, 174
 I 10, 9–14 138 n. 107
 I 10, 14 91 n. 29, 138 n. 105
 I 10, 15 23 n. 67, 138 n. 108
 I 10, 24 138 n. 108
 I 10, 26 32 n. 42, 92 n. 35
 I 10, 29 138 n. 108
 I 10, 32 139 n. 112
 II 2, 48 38 n. 82, 180
 II 2, 52 5 n. 28
 II 2, 52–53 131 n. 56
 II 2, 52–62 150 n. 197
 II 2, 53 167, 174
 II 2, 57 147 n. 172
 II 2, 61 92 n. 35
 II 3, 26 178
 II 4, 1 151 n. 206, 174
 II 5, 3 174
 II 6, 1 151 n. 207
 II 6, 9 151 n. 207
 II 6, 13 174
 III 1, 1 128 n. 41
 III 3, 17 174
 III 10, 21 38 n. 82, 180
 V 3, 2 170, 174
 IX 17, 1–9 155 n. 229
 IX 17, 3 155 n. 231
 IX 17, 9 155 n. 230
 IX 18, 2 155 n. 229
 IX 22 156 n. 238
 IX 27 156 n. 236
 IX 29, 16 158 n. 252
 IX 34, 16 155 n. 226
 X 12, 17–19 170, 174
 X 12, 23 66 n. 250
 XIV 16, 1 10 n. 57, 149 n. 187
 XIV 16, 13 174
 Eustath. Comment. ad Hom. Iliad. XIV
 320 (III 653 van der Valk) 34 n. 57
 Eustath. Comment. ad Hom. Odyss. III
 381 5 n. 28, 10 n. 57
 Eustath. Comm. in Dion. Orb. descr. 409
 (GGM II 292) 87 n. 1
 Expos. tot. mundi 44 (SCh 124, 180) 43
 n. 114
 Ezechiel, Exodus 248–253 158 n. 252
 Festus, De verb. signif. p. 408 Lind-
 say 120 n. 60
 Firm. Mat. De err. prof. rel. 6, 1 174
 6, 1–5 151
 6, 6–8 151
 7, 1–6 14 n. 7, 121 n. 70, 151

- 7, 6 38 n. 82, 170, 174, 180
 8, 4 151 n. 208
 10, 1 121 n. 70, 151
 12, 8 170, 174
 15, 5 – 16, 2 143 n. 138
 16, 3 151 n. 207, 174
 Fulgent. Expos. serm. ant. 2 177
- Galenus, Protr. 9 173
 Galenus in Al-Biruni, Al-Hind p. 168 Sachau 168
 Ps.-Galenus, Hist. philos. 35 pp. 617–618
 Diels 6 n. 34, 10 n. 87
 Gellius, Noct. Att. II 29, 3 sqq. 115
 VI 1, 3 110 n. 5
 VI 1, 6 110 n. 4
 Georg. Mon. Chronicon I 4, 15 (PG 110, 105 B) 154 n. 221
 Gnom. Vat. 53 42 n. 109
 236 57 n. 197
 Gorgon, FGrHist 515 F 19 61 n. 219
 Gotifredus Viterb. Speculum regum (MGH SS 22, 37–39) 153 n. 215
 Greg. Naz. Or. 5, 32 (PG 35, 705 B) 38 n. 82, 180
 Or. 14, 26 (PG 35, 891) 42 n. 110
 Greg. Nyss. In inscript. Psalm. 1, 18 80 n. 56
- Harpocr. Lex. s.v. ἐνὴ καὶ νέα (p. 94 Keaney) 60 n. 215
 Hdt. Hist. I 65, 4 84 n. 75
 I 65, 4–5 84 n. 75
 I 94, 1 85
 I 181, 2 32 n. 42, 92 n. 35
 II 44, 1–2 93 n. 42
 II 44, 5 30 n. 21
 II 99–142 95 n. 52
 II 102–106 95 n. 50
 II 144 66 n. 245
 II 164, 1 82 n. 63
 III 20 76 n. 29, 96 n. 62
 III 37 88 n. 13
 III 98, 1 75 n. 25
 III 105, 2 75 n. 25
 III 107 71 n. 3
 IV 87 95 n. 50
 IV 91 95 n. 50
 IV 181, 4 88 n. 11, 88 n. 12
 VIII 55 88 n. 11
 IX 80 76 n. 29, 96 n. 62
 Hecat. Abd. FGrHist 264 F 1 65 n. 244
 F 5 91 n. 26
 F 6 23 n. 60
 F 7 16 n. 26, 90 n. 21
 F 8 20 n. 42
 F 25 22 n. 50, 22 n. 52, 82 n. 63, 82 n. 66, 91 n. 26, 91 n. 29
 Hecat. Mil. FGrHist 1 F 25 46 n. 130
 F 26 46 n. 130
 F 27 46 n. 129
 Hellanicus, FGrHist 4 F 28 46 n. 131
 Heraclid. Pont. fr. 83 Wehrli 43 n. 113
 Heraclit. Ephes. DK 22 B 127 = fr. 119 a¹ Marcovich 151 n. 208
 Hermippus, fr. 20 Wehrli = FGrHist 1026 F 25 43 n. 113
 Herodorus, FGrHist 31 F 63 bis = fr. **52 A Fowler 46 n. 132
 Herondas 1, 30 62 n. 227
 2, 97 31 n. 30
 4, 1–2 31 n. 30
 Hes. Ehoiai fr. 25, 26–33 Merkelbach-West 29 n. 12
 fr. 51 33 n. 49
 fr. 59–60 31 n. 28
 fr. 229, 6–13 29 n. 12
 Hes. Theog. 46 42 n. 108
 950–953 29 n. 12
 Hesych. Lex. s.v. Βῆλος 92 n. 35
 Γελχάνος 36 n. 74
 Τρίφυλοι 87 n. 1
 χάσιος 72 n. 6
 Hier. Comment. in Esaiam XVIII 65 (CCL 73, 747) 175, 177
 Hier. Comment. in Math. III 16, 16 (CCL 77, 140) 175
 Hier. De vir. illustr. 22 175
 Hier. Ep. 70, 2 (CSEL 54, 701) 38 n. 82, 180
 Hier. In ep. Pauli ad Tit. 1 (CCL 77 C, 30) 38 n. 82, 180
 Hippodamus, DK 39 A 1 82 n. 65
 Hom. Il. II 729 31 n. 25
 IV 194 31 n. 25
 V 78 42 n. 111
 XVI 605 42 n. 111
 XVIII 117–119 29 n. 14
 XXII 393–394 41 n. 102
 XXIV 258–259 41 n. 102
 Hom. Od. VIII 325 42 n. 108
 VIII 467–468 41 n. 104
 XI 484 41 n. 103
 XI 601–603 29 n. 11
 XIV 205 42 n. 111
 XV 403–414 16 n. 25
 Hor. Carm. III 3, 9–16 168
 IV 8, 15b – 19a 113 n. 24

- IV 8, 17 113 n. 24
 IV 8, 22–34 168
 Hor. Ep. II 1, 5–6 168, 172
 Hrabanus Maurus, *De universo* 15, 6 (PL 111, 426–436) 153 n. 216
 Hyg. *De astr.* II 13, 4 23 n. 65, 24 n. 70
 II 20 22 n. 52, 66 n. 250
 II 42, 5 22 n. 53, 23 n. 66, 124 n. 9
 Hyg. *Fab.* 147 29 n. 10
 224 130 n. 52, 168, 173
 274, 4 89 n. 15, 124 n. 9
 Hyg. fr. 6 Peter (HRR II 73–74) = fr. 17 Funaioli (GRF p. 535) 141 n. 127
 Hymn. Hom. in Apoll. 388 sqq. 96 n. 57
 Hymn. Hom. in Cer. 48 sqq. 32 n. 36
 239 sqq. 29 n. 10
 272 88 n. 11
 Hymn. in Iov. Dict. 1–36 (II 1–2 Furley-Bremer) 37 n. 76
 Hyperides, C. Demosth. fr. 8, col. 31 57 n. 197
- Iambl. *De myst.* I 2 94 n. 46
 III 11 88 n. 11
 Iambl. *Vita Pyth.* 29–30 85 n. 82
 30 43 n. 1113
 72 85 n. 82
 81 85 n. 82
 140 43 n. 113
 255 43 n. 113
 257 85 n. 82
 IG II² 1, 649 60 n. 214
 II² 3, 4960 32
 IG IV² 1, 136 31 n. 33
 IG XII 2, 645 45 n. 124
 Ioh. Ant. Hist. fr. 5 (FHG IV 542) 38 n. 83, 40 n. 5, 180
 fr. 6, 4 (FHG IV 542) = fr. 6, 2 Roberto 38 n. 83, 180
 Ioh. Chrys. In ep. 2 ad Cor. hom. 26, 4 (PG 61, 580) 57 n. 195
 Ioh. Chrys. In ep. Pauli ad Tit. hom. 3, 1 (PG 62, 677 A) 38 n. 82, 40 n. 97, 180
 Ios. Ant. Iud. VIII 6, 4 137, 155 n. 225
 Ios. Bell. Iud. IV 661 24 n. 68
 Ios. C. Ap. I 176–182 23 n. 60
 I 215–217 23 n. 60
 Isho'dad, Comment. in Acta ap. p. 29 Gibson 38 n. 83, 181
 Isid. Etym. VIII 11 153 n. 214
 VIII 11, 1–4 175
 XIV 3, 15 72 n. 5
 Isocr. Bus. 15 82 n. 66
 16–18 82 n. 63
- Isocr. Ep. ad Phil. 3, 5 43 n. 115
 Isocr. Euag. 70 43 n. 112
 72 42 n. 111
 Isocr. Or. 5, 33 30 n. 20
 Isocr. Phil. 132 43 n. 112
 Iul. Ap. Misop. 361 D 24 n. 68
 Iust. Apol. 9, 1 173
 21, 2–3 168
 24, 2 151 n. 206, 173
 Iust. Dial. cum Tryph. 69, 1–3 168
 Iust. Epit. Pomp. Tr. XVI 5, 8–11 52 n. 165
 XLIII 1 141
- Κόρη Κόσμου 2 (Corp. Herm. IV 21 Nock) 22 n. 50
- Lact. *De ave phoenice* 88 121 n. 74
 Lact. *De ira dei* 11, 7–8 174
 Lact. Div. inst. I 5, 20 129 n. 46
 I 6, 8 132 n. 67
 I 10, 1–2 174
 I 10, 2 177
 I 11, 17 174
 I 11, 33 9 n. 55, 87 n. 1, 90 n. 26, 76 n. 28, 147 n. 172
 I 11, 35 5 n. 28, 22 n. 52, 28 n. 6, 92 n. 38, 101 n. 17
 I 11, 45 22 n. 51, 22 n. 55, 28 n. 6, 76 n. 28, 93 n. 38, 101 n. 17, 124 n. 9, 147 n. 175
 I 11, 46 23 n. 63, 38 n. 81, 40 n. 95, 179
 I 11, 48 38 n. 82, 180
 I 11, 63 23 n. 67
 I 11, 65 179
 I 13, 2 22 n. 50, 28 n. 6, 92 n. 38, 101 n. 17, 124 n. 9
 I 13, 8 137 n. 99, 140 n. 121, 142, 174
 I 14, 8 156 n. 240
 I 14, 10 23 n. 63
 I 14, 11–12 141 n. 125
 I 15, 5–6 170, 174
 I 15, 19–20 172, 174
 I 15, 20 167
 I 15, 23 170, 174
 I 15, 26 170, 174
 I 15, 26–27 174
 I 17, 5 174
 I 17, 9–10 14 n. 6, 23 n. 64
 I 17, 10 124 n. 9
 I 18, 1 170, 174
 I 18, 2 151 n. 206
 I 18, 3 174
 I 18, 13 110 n. 6

- I 22, 21–27 32 n. 41
 I 22, 22 92 n. 36, 147 n. 174
 I 22, 23 23 n. 62, 24 n. 68
 I 22, 26 28 n. 6, 92 n. 38
 I 22, 27 147 n. 173
 II 1, 5 151 n. 206, 174
 II 2, 2–4 174
 II 2, 4 151 n. 206
 II 2, 9 151 n. 206, 174
 Lact. Epit. div. inst. 6, 4 174
 8, 2 177
 9, 1 14 n. 6
 13, 1 5 n. 28
 13, 1–3 9 n. 55
 13, 2 174
 13, 4 38 n. 81, 179
 13, 4–5 101 n. 17
 Lact. Placid. Schol. Stat. Theb. II 63–64
 p. 102 Sweeney 179
 IV 481–483 p. 290 143 n. 138
 Leo Pellaeus, FGrHist 659 T 2 a 131
 n. 61, 167, 171
 T 2 b 131 n. 61, 171
 F 2 132 n. 61
 F 3 91 n. 26
 F 5 131 n. 61, 171
 F 6 171
 F 9 a 22 n. 52
 Lib. Or. 18, 172 (II 310–311 Foerster) 24
 n. 68
 Linus 55 T Bernabé 126 n. 20
 Liv. XXIV 3, 6 94 n. 45
 XXVI 19, 5–6 110 n. 4
 XXVI 19, 7 110 n. 5
 XXVI 19, 8 111 n. 15
 XXVII 19, 4–5 111 n. 13
 XXVIII 46, 16 95 n. 50
 XXXVIII 56, 11–13 112 n. 15
 Longus, Daphnis et Chloe IV 2–3 90
 LSCG 151 C, 8–15 30 n. 21
 Luc. Alex. 61 43 n. 113
 Luc. Deor. conc. 6 38 n. 81, 179
 Luc. De sacrif. 10 38 n. 81, 179
 Luc. Iup. trag. 45 38 n. 81, 179
 Luc. Philops. 3 38 n. 81
 Luc. Quomodo hist. conser. sit 41 80 n. 56
 Luc. Timon 6 38 n. 81, 179
 Ps.-Luc. Philopatris 10 (IV 375 Macleod)
 38 n. 83, 181
 Lucan. Phars. VIII 872 38 n. 81, 179
 X 144 87 n. 5
 Lucr. De rer. nat. II 417 121 n. 74
 V 8 43 n. 113
 VI 848 88 n. 11
 Lyd. De mens. IV 51 143 n. 138
 IV 64 143 n. 138
 IV 67 143 n. 138
 IV 71 143 n. 138
 IV 86 143 n. 138
 IV 142 143 n. 138, 177
 Macrobius. Comment. in Somn. Scip. I 9,
 6 174
 Macrobius. Sat. I 7, 24 141 n. 127, 174
 I 10, 22 146 n. 166
 Malalas, Chronogr. II 15 p. 32 Thurn 34
 n. 58, 34 n. 59, 128 n. 39, 178
 II 18 p. 39 Thurn 175
 Manetho, FGrHist 609 T 11 a 94 n. 46
 T 11 b 66 n. 246
 T 11 c 66 n. 246
 Manil. Astron. IV 933–935 172
 Marcian. Epit. peripl. Men. (GGM I
 565) 7 n. 38
 Mart. Brac. De corr. rust. 7–8 151
 Mart. Cap. De nupt. VI 701 92 n. 35
 Mart. Epigr. II 43, 9 87 n. 5
 Mart. Philippi 1, 8 (Acta sanct. IX,
 546) 177
 Mart. Rom. Ign. 3, 2 (II 343–344 Funk-
 Diekamp) 38 n. 82, 177, 180
 Max. Tyr. Dissert. 2, 5 173
 9, 7 169
 Megasthenes. Ind. FGrHist 715 F 4 82 n. 64,
 145 n. 159
 F 8 23 n. 60
 F 11 a 33 n. 46
 F 11 b 33 n. 46
 F 12 22 n. 51, 33 n. 46, 145 n. 161
 F 13 a 75 n. 25
 F 19 a 82 n. 64
 F 19 b 82 n. 64
 F 27 b 75 n. 25
 F 42 136 n. 93, 136 n. 94
 Mela, Chorogr. I 39 88 n. 11, 88 n. 12
 II 43 88 n. 11
 II 112 38 n. 81, 179
 Ps.-Meliton, Or. p. 43 l. 10 – p. 45 l. 11
 Cureton 173
 Memnon, FGrHist 434 F 1 52 n. 165
 Mich. Psellus, ἀλληγορία εἰς τὸν Τάν-
 ταλον p. 154 Duffy 38 n. 83, 181
 Min. Fel. Oct. 8, 4 151 n. 207, 174
 21, 1 23 n. 58, 177
 21, 1–2 9 n. 55
 21, 2 48 n. 141, 48 n. 142, 100 n. 6, 107
 n. 57, 130 n. 50, 150 n. 197, 171
 21, 3 67 n. 251, 131 n. 61, 171

- 22, 1 151 n. 208
 22, 7 169, 174
 23, 9 137 n. 99, 140 n. 121, 140 n. 123,
 174
 23, 13 38 n. 82, 174, 180
 Mnaseas, fr. 9 Cappelletto 177
 fr. 31 132 n. 63
 Myth. Vat. II c. 2 (CCL 91 C, 96) 175
 c. 119 (CCL 91 C, 187) 29 n. 10

 Nag Ham. Cod. VI 6, 61–62 p. 321 Rob-
 inson 94 n. 46
 Naupactia, fr. 10 A–B Davies 33 n. 51
 Nearchus, FGrHist 133 F 6 78 n. 46
 F 7 78 n. 46
 F 8 a 78 n. 46
 F 8 b 78 n. 46
 F 9 78 n. 46
 F 10 a 78 n. 46
 F 10 b 78 n. 46
 F 22 78 n. 46
 F 23 85 n. 83
 F 31 93 n. 39
 Nepos, Vita Cat. 1, 4 113 n. 23
 Nepos, fr. 1 Peter (HRR II 25) = fr. 3 Mar-
 shall 142
 Nicol. Damasc. FGrHist 90 F 103 aa 84
 n. 77
 Nonnus, Dionys. VIII 114–118 38 n. 81,
 180
 Nonnus Abbas, Collect. et expos. hist. ad
 Greg. Naz. Or. 2 C. Iul. 30 (PG 36,
 1049 D-1052 A) 38 n. 83, 180
 Novum Testamentum
 Eph. 2, 12 149 n. 191
 Ep. ad Tit. 1, 12 34 n. 61

 OGIS 6, 20–23 59 n. 200
 8 a 53 n. 174
 56, 55 45 n. 124
 Onesicrit. FGrHist 134 F 7 78 n. 46
 F 13 78 n. 46
 F 15 78 n. 46
 F 16 a 78 n. 46
 F 16 b 78 n. 46
 F 21 75 n. 25
 F 22 78 n. 46
 F 24 75 n. 25
 F 34 93 n. 39
 F 35 93 n. 39
 Orac. Sib. III 97–103 157 n. 242
 III 97–104 157 n. 242
 III 105 157 n. 242
 III 108–113 157 n. 242

 III 110–154 156, 157 n. 243
 III 111–112 24 n. 67
 VIII 47–48 38 n. 82, 179
 Orig. C. Cels. I 1 150 n. 194
 III 22 169, 174
 III 34–35 169, 174
 III 42 169, 174
 III 43 38 n. 82, 39 n. 89, 180
 VII 35 169
 Orig. Exhort. ad mart. 32 150 n. 193
 Orig. Hom. in Ierem. 5, 3 174
 Ovid. Amor. III 8, 51–52 168
 Ovid. Fasti I 206 sqq. 118 n. 51
 Ovid. Met. X 309 121 n. 74
 X 478 121 n. 74
 XV 309–310 88 n. 11

 Paulin. Nol. Poema 19, 86 (CSEL 30,
 121) 38 n. 82, 180
 Paus. Graec. descr. I 8, 6 61 n. 218
 I 14, 2 32 n. 37
 I 15, 3 30 n. 20
 I 32, 4–6 30 n. 20
 I 34, 2 169, 173
 I 37, 2 32 n. 39
 I 38, 6 88 n. 11
 II 10, 1 30 n. 21
 II 10, 2 88 n. 13
 II 10, 4 88 n. 13
 II 17, 1 88 n. 1
 II 18, 3 32 n. 38
 II 22, 1 32 n. 37
 II 26, 7 31 n. 27
 II 26, 10 31 n. 30
 II 35, 4 32 n. 38
 III 2, 4 84 n. 75
 III 18, 3 72 n. 7
 III 25, 4 46 n. 129
 V 17, 4 53 n. 177
 V 20, 9–10 53 n. 177, 54 n. 178
 V 20, 10 54 n. 177
 VI 20, 3 88 n. 13
 VII 27, 9 32 n. 38
 VIII 2, 4 169, 173
 VIII 10, 3 88 n. 13
 VIII 15, 3–4 32 n. 40
 VIII 30, 8 9 n. 53
 VIII 31, 5 88 n. 13
 VIII 36, 3 88 n. 13
 VIII 38, 6 88 n. 13
 VIII 47, 4 88 n. 11
 IX 16, 1 72 n. 7
 X 8, 9 88 n. 11
 X 24, 7 88 n. 11

- P. Berol. 21243, 1–5 p. 262 Brashear 94 n. 46
- P. Cairo Zenon 59355, l. 102–103 et l. 128 (III 89–90 Edgar) 3 n. 16
- Peripl. Ponti Eux. 49, 6 (GGM I 413) 85 n. 83
- Persaeus, SVF I 448 48 n. 142, 107 n. 57, 130 n. 50, 171
- Petrus Comestor, Hist. schol. (PL 198, 1053–1644) 153
- P. Flinders Petrie 25 (=P. Litt. Lond. 191) 35, 38 n. 81, 179
- PGM VIII 42 94 n. 46
- Pherecyd. Athen. FGrHist 3 F 35 a = fr. 35 Fowler 33 n. 53
- Pherecyd. Syr. fr. 68 Schibli 116 n. 40 fr. 69 116 n. 40
- P. Hibeh 99 ed. Turner 62 n. 226
- P. Hibeh 186 125 n. 18
- P. Hibeh 199 62 n. 226
- Philo Alex. Leg. ad Gai. 78 (VI 170 Cohn-Reiter) 168
- Philo Alex. Vita Mos. I 23 (IV 125 Cohn) 91 n. 26
- Philo Bybl. FGrHist 790 F 1 94 n. 47, 131 n. 56, 137 n. 103, 138 n. 105, 138 n. 106, 172
- F 2 23 n. 67, 32 n. 42, 91 n. 29, 92 n. 35, 137 n. 103, 138 n. 105, 139 n. 112
- F 3 137 n. 103
- F 4 137 n. 103
- Philochorus, FGrHist 328 F 7 a 34 n. 59
- F 7 b 34 n. 59, 178
- F 97 146 n. 166
- F 166 60 n. 215
- F 175 178
- Philod. De piet. 34 c p. 7 Gomperz = p. 78 Schober 167
- 45 b p. 17 Gomperz = p. 80 Schober 33 n. 52
- 52 a p. 24 Gomperz = p. 108 Schober 38 n. 81, 179
- 9–10 p. 75–76 Gomperz = p. 117 Schober 171
- 13 (P. Herc. 1428) p. 80 Gomperz = p. 119 Schober 171
- p. 78 Schober 167
- I 19, 523–536 Obbink 107 n. 56
- Philod. P. Herc. 1428, col. II 28 – III 13 Henrichs 48 n. 141, 100 n. 6, 107 n. 57, 130 n. 50
- Philostr. Vita Apoll. II 43 (I 84 Kayser) 95 n. 50
- V 5 (I 168 Kayser) 93 n. 42
- Philostr. Vitae soph. II 4 (II 76 Kayser) 38 n. 81, 39 n. 90, 180
- Phot. Bibl. 72 p. 46 b 75 n. 25
- 166 p. 111 b 35–37 (II 148 Henry) 148 n. 178
- 190 p. 147 b 37 (III 55 Henry) 38 n. 81, 179
- 224 p. 222 b 52 n. 165
- Pind. Nem. 3, 22 30 n. 23
- Pind. Olymp. 7, 87 24 n. 68
- Pind. Pyth. 3, 7 31 n. 29
- 3, 56–57 33 n. 54
- Pl. Critias 110 CD 84 n. 78
- 112 B 82 n. 66
- 112 D 88 n. 11
- 113 C – 121 C 16 n. 26
- 114 E 75 n. 25, 78 n. 43
- 116 C – 117 A 90 n. 21
- 119 A 83 n. 73
- 119 CD 93 n. 43
- Pl. Leg. I 624 AB 84 n. 74
- III 676 A – 681 D 85 n. 81
- V 739 D 84 n. 78
- V 740 A 84 n. 78
- V 740 A – 742 C 75 n. 24
- V 744 D – 745 B 75 n. 24
- X 889 E – 890 A 106 n. 54
- X 891 B – 899 D 107 n. 55
- Pl. Phaedr. 245 C – 246 A 107 n. 55
- 274 CD 91 n. 29
- 274 DE 22 n. 52
- Pl. Phileb. 18 BC 91 n. 29
- Pl. Prot. 320 C – 322 D 116
- Pl. Resp. II 379 C 42 n. 108
- III 415 AB 82 n. 66
- III 416 D sqq. 84 n. 78
- IV 500 D 43 n. 113
- V 464 sqq. 84 n. 78
- Pl. Symp. 180 DE 23 n. 66
- Pl. Tim. 18 B 84 n. 78
- 22 A – 25 D 95 n. 52
- 23 D – 25 D 84
- 23 E 91 n. 26, 95 n. 53
- 24 A 82 n. 63
- 24 AC 73 n. 13
- 24 D – 25 D 16 n. 26
- 27 B 91 n. 26
- Ps.-Pl. Epinomis 981 E 107 n. 60
- 983 E 107 n. 60
- 984 D 107 n. 60
- Ps.-Pl. Minos 320 A 84 n. 75
- Plaut. Amphitruo 41 sqq. 111 n. 12
- Plaut. Asinar. 713 41 n. 107

- Plaut. Captivi 863 41 n. 107
 Plaut. Persa 99–100 41 n. 107
 Plaut. Pseudol. 328 41 n. 107
 Plin. Nat. hist. I 36 120
 II 18 42 n. 109
 II 19 172
 II 228 88 n. 11
 IV 52 24 n. 68
 V 31 88 n. 11, 88 n. 12
 V 68 24 n. 68
 VI 81 78 n. 46
 VI 121 32 n. 42, 92 n. 35
 VII 197 89 n. 15, 124 n. 9
 X 3–4 120
 XII 54 72 n. 5
 XVI 42 87 n. 5
 XXIV 71 72 n. 4
 XXXII 16 24 n. 68
 XXXVI 79 22 n. 58, 120
 XXXVII 75 93 n. 142
 Plut. Aetia Graeca 45, 301 F 24 n. 68
 Plut. Amat. 18, 763 D 151 n. 208
 Plut. De Alex. fort. aut virt II 5, 338 A 60
 n. 210
 5, 338 B 52 n. 165
 Plut. De daed. Plat. fr. 157 Sandbach 128
 n. 41
 Plut. De def. orac. 10, 415 A 128 n. 41
 Plut. De Is. et Os. 6, 353 B 91 n. 26
 15, 357 AC 29 n. 10
 23, 359 E – 360 B 79 n. 48, 172
 23, 360 A 5 n. 28, 67 n. 253, 90 n. 26
 23, 360 AB 2 n. 8, 9 n. 54
 29, 362 B 128 n. 41
 35, 365 A 178
 70, 379 B 151 n. 208
 Plut. Demetr. 10, 4 59 n. 203
 10, 5 60 n. 208, 60 n. 209, 60 n. 210
 10, 6 59 n. 206
 12, 2 60 n. 214
 12, 3 60 n. 208
 12, 4 59 n. 205
 13 60 n. 212
 23, 5 60 n. 211
 34, 5 60 n. 213
 46, 1 59 n. 203
 Plut. De stoic. rep. 38, 1051 E 42 n. 108
 38, 1051 F 42 n. 108
 Plut. De superst. 13, 171 E 151 n. 208
 Plut. Dion 29 51 n. 158
 29, 1 46 n. 127
 41–48 51 n. 159
 46, 1 46 n. 127, 51 n. 159
 Plut. Flam. 10, 7 112 n. 16
 16, 5–7 112 n. 17
 Plut. Lyc. 4 84 n. 75
 12 84 n. 77
 Plut. Lys. 18 49
 18, 5 49 n. 150
 18, 5–6 49 n. 144
 25 72 n. 7
 Plut. Per. 8, 9 41 n. 105
 Plut. Praec. ger. reipubl. 8, 804 B 57 n. 197
 Plut. Quaest. conv. VII 1, 714 B 84 n. 77
 Plut. Romul. 27, 1 80 n. 56
 Plut. Sept. sap. conv. 10, 153 F – 154
 A 35 n. 68
 10, 154 A 36 n. 72, 38 n. 81, 179
 Plut. Thes. 25, 2 82 n. 66
 Ps.-Plut. Apophth. Lac. 210 CD (Agesilaus 25) 49 n. 151
 219 E (Damis) 56 n. 190
 228 E (Licurgus 26) 152 n. 208
 Ps.-Plut. Plac. phil. 879 C 129 n. 46
 880 C 130 n. 49, 172
 880 D 6 n. 34
 880 DE 3 n. 14
 880 EF 47 n. 135
 Ps.-Plut. Vitae X orat. 842 D 57 n. 197
 Pollux, Onomast. I 40–41 42 n. 108
 Polyaen. Strat. VIII 26 95 n. 50
 Polyb. Hist. III 56, 4 95 n. 50
 III 59, 7 9 n. 53
 VI 45, 3 84 n. 76
 IX 27, 7 24 n. 68
 X 10, 11 133 n. 71
 X 11–14 111 n. 12
 X 40, 2–5 111 n. 13
 XII 12 b, 3 57 n. 197
 XV 35 111
 XXXIV 2, 5 133 n. 71, 171
 XXXIV 5 5 n. 28, 8 n. 51, 79 n. 48
 Porph. Ad Marcell. 7 p. 278 Nauck 169,
 174
 Porph. De abst. II 26, 1 23 n. 60
 II 56, 1 137 n. 102
 IV 2, 1–9 85 n. 81
 Porph. FGrHist 260 F 34 138 n. 105
 Porph. Vita Pyth. 16 177
 17 38 n. 81, 39 n. 91, 40 n. 97, 93
 n. 39, 180
 20 43 n. 113
 Porphyrio, Comment. in Hor. ep. II 1, 5
 p. 369 Holder 169
 Proclus, In Plat. Tim. I 102, 20–22
 Diehl 94 n. 46
 Procop. De bell Goth. VIII 22, 25–26 24
 n. 68

- Prodicus, DK 84 B 5 100 n. 6, 171
 Prudent. C. Symm. I 145–158 175
 Prudent. Perist. V 35–36 175
 Ptol. Chen. Nova hist. II 16 p. 22 Chatzis 38 n. 81, 179
 Pyrgion, FGrHist 467 F 1 84 n. 77
 Pytheas, fr. 21 Bianchetti 8 n. 51
- Res gestae Divi Aug. 8, 5 147 n. 173
- Saxo Gram. Gesta Danorum I 7, 1–3 154
 Schol. Aesch. Suppl. 859 (I 81 Smith) 72 n. 6
 Schol. Apoll. Rhod. II 904 p. 193 Wendel 33 n. 46
 IV 257–262 c p. 274 66 n. 250
 Schol. Arat. 73 p. 108 Martin 38 n. 83, 181
 Schol. Aristoph. Lys. 90 p. 249 Dübner 72 n. 6
 Schol. Callim. Hymn. Iov. 8 (II 42 Pfeiffer) 38 n. 83, 40, 181
 Schol. Carm. Greg. Naz. p. 49 Gaisford 38 n. 83, 181
 Schol. Clem. Alex. Protr. II 24, 2 p. 304 Stählin 3 n. 14, 5 n. 28, 10 n. 57
 Schol. Dem. Olynth. 1, 5 (I 26 Dilts) 55 n. 184
 Schol. Eur. Alcest. 1 (II 216 Schwartz) 33 n. 53
 Schol. Hom. Iliad. XIV 319 (III 641 Erbse) 34 n. 57
 XXI 242 (IV 264 Dindorf) 46 n. 131
 Schol. Luc. Iov. trag. 45 p. 78 Rabe 38 n. 83, 181
 Schol. Lycophr. Alex. 207 (II 98 Scheer) 178
 Schol. Pind. Nem. 3, 4 60 n. 215
 Schol. Theocr. 7, 5 p. 78 Wendel 72 n. 6
 Schol. Tzetz. Alleg. Iliad. IV 37 3 n. 14, 10 n. 57
- Ps.-Scymnus, Orb. descr. 653–655 (GGM I 221) 7 n. 38
 856–857 (GGM I 232) 85 n. 83
 Sed. Scot. Collect. in ep. Pauli ad Tit. (PL 103, 244 C) 38 n. 83, 181
 SEG 28, 60 61 n. 222
 41, 75 45 n. 125
 Sen. De benef. III 15, 4 42 n. 109
 Serv. Comment. Verg. Aen. I 297 (I 110 Thilo) 143 n. 138
 IV 577 (I 565–566 Thilo) 143 n. 138
 VII 180 (II 140 Thilo) 38 n. 81, 180
 VIII 275 (II 236 Thilo) 131 n. 56, 167, 171
- Serv. Comment. Verg. Georg. I 19 (III 1, 136 Thilo) 29 n. 10
 II 139 (III 1, 232 Thilo) 87 n. 1
 IV 287 (III 1, 342 Thilo) 67 n. 259
 Severianus, In ep. Pauli ad Tit. 1, 12–13 p. 344 Staab 38 n. 82, 180
 Sext. Emp. Adv. math. IX 15 105 n. 45
 IX 17 10 n. 57, 22 n. 50, 105 n. 41, 173
 IX 18 48 n. 141, 100 n. 6
 IX 19 47 n. 138, 100 n. 6
 IX 24 48 n. 139, 100 n. 6
 IX 34 173
 IX 35–37 169
 IX 50–52 10 n. 57
 IX 51 173
 IX 52 48 n. 141, 100 n. 6
 IX 54 47 n. 135, 100 n. 6
 Sext. Emp. Pyrrh. hyp. III 224 24 n. 68
 Sidon. Apollin. Carm. V 47 122 n. 74
 SIG³ 390 61 n. 222
 III³, 1027 30 n. 21
 Sil. Ital. Pun. XIII 628 sqq. 110 n. 6
 XV 69 sqq. 110 n. 6
 XV 78–83 168, 172
 Sisypheus, FGrHist 50 F 3 140 n. 119
 Socr. Schol. Hist. eccl. III 23 170, 175
 Solin. Collect. rer. memor.
 11, 6–7 38 n. 81, 39 n. 92, 179
 33, 5 72 n. 5
 34, 1 24 n. 68
 56, 3 32 n. 42
 Stat. Theb. I 278–279 38 n. 81, 179
 Steph. Byz. s.v. Ἀστερουσία 72 n. 8
 Ἀφύτη ἢ Ἀφουτίς 72 n. 7
 Ἀτάβυρον 24 n. 68
 Βέργη 6 n. 37
 Δωδώνη 88 n. 10
 Κάσιον 24 n. 68
 Κρητηνία 24 n. 68
 Τριφυλία 87 n. 1
- Stesichorus, fr. 194 Davies 33 n. 50
 Stesimbrotus, FGrHist 107 F 9 41 n. 105
 Stob. I 49, 44 (I 406 Wachsmuth) 22 n. 50
 II 9, 4 (II 178 Wachsmuth) 42 n. 108
 IV 2, 25 (IV 162 Hense) 84 n. 77
 IV 34, 70 (IV 846 Hense) 55 n. 181
 Str. Geogr. I 2, 15 p. 23–24 133 n. 71, 171
 I 3, 1 p. 47 2 n. 8, 6 n. 37, 8 n. 48, 79 n. 48
 II 3, 5 p. 100 6 n. 38
 II 3, 5 p. 102 2 n. 8, 79 n. 48
 II 4, 2 p. 104 2 n. 8, 5 n. 28, 8 n. 48, 79 n. 48
 VII 3, 6 p. 299 2 n. 8, 8 n. 50, 79 n. 48

- VII 3, 9 p. 302 85 n. 83
 VII 5, 5 p. 315 85 n. 85
 VIII 3, 3 p. 337 87 n. 1
 VIII 3, 9 p. 341 46 n. 130
 IX 5, 15 p. 436 44 n. 120
 IX 5, 17 p. 437 31 n. 27, 31 n. 30
 X 3, 9 p. 467 42 n. 109
 X 4, 16 p. 480 84 n. 77
 X 4, 18 p. 481 84 n. 75
 X 5, 5 p. 486 71 n. 1
 XIV 1, 21 p. 640 44 n. 120
 XIV 2, 12 p. 655 24 n. 68
 XIV 2, 25 p. 659 24 n. 68
 XV 1, 6–7 p. 686–687 33 n. 46
 XV 1, 18 p. 692 78 n. 46
 XV 1, 21 p. 694 78 n. 46
 XV 1, 22 p. 694 78 n. 46
 XV 1, 28 p. 698 78 n. 46
 XV 1, 30 p. 700 75 n. 25
 XV 1, 34 p. 702 75 n. 25
 XV 1, 39–49 p. 703–707 82 n. 64
 XV 1, 43 p. 705 78 n. 46
 XV 1, 44 p. 705 78 n. 46
 XV 1, 45 p. 706 78 n. 46
 XV 1, 57 p. 711 75 n. 25
 XV 1, 66 p. 717 85 n. 83
 XV 1, 69 p. 718 78 n. 46
 XV 3, 7 p. 730 93 n. 39
 XV 3, 8 p. 730 93 n. 39
 XVI 2, 33 p. 760 24 n. 68
 XVI 4, 4 p. 768 71 n. 3
 XVI 4, 4 p. 769 95 n. 50
 XVI 4, 14 p. 774 71 n. 3
 XVI 4, 19 p. 778 71 n. 3
 XVI 4, 25 p. 782 71 n. 3
 XVII 1, 3 p. 787 82 n. 66
 XVII 1, 5 p. 790 95 n. 50
 XVII 1, 28 p. 805 88 n. 9
 Suda, Lex. s.v. Ἐννίος (II 283–285 Adler) 112 n. 19
 Κάσιον ὄρος (III 39) 24 n. 68
 Κλέαρχος (III 126–127) 52 n. 165
 Λίνος (III 273) 126 n. 20
 Πῆκος (IV 124) 38 n. 83, 40 n. 97, 181
 χαία (IV 779) 72 n. 6
 Suet. Aug. 67, 2 137 n. 100
 Suet. Nero 22, 3 24 n. 68
 Symeon Metaphr. Mart. Ign. 7, 4 (II 387 Funk-Diekamp) 175
 7, 5 (II 387) 38 n. 83, 177, 181
 Syncel. Ecl. chronogr. 29 p. 17 Mosshammer 66 n. 246
 32 p. 18 66 n. 246
 72 p. 41 94 n. 46
 289 p. 179 38 n. 83, 181
 307 p. 190 34 n. 58, 34 n. 59, 128 n. 38, 178
 Tac. Annal. IV 38 168, 172
 XI 14, 2 126 n. 20
 Tat. Or. ad Gr. 8, 8 178
 27 66 n. 250, 128 n. 41
 27, 4 38 n. 82, 179
 Terent. Adelph. 535 41 n. 107
 Tert. Adv. nat. II 7, 4 173
 II 9, 10 173
 II 12 137 n. 99, 140 n. 121
 II 12, 4 173
 II 14 131 n. 56
 II 14, 1 173
 II 14, 1–15, 1 169
 II 17 38 n. 82, 180
 Tert. Apolog. 10 137 n. 99
 10, 3–4 173
 10, 7 140 n. 121, 173
 10, 9–11 173
 11, 1 173
 12, 1 173
 25 38 n. 82, 180
 Tert. De corona 7 66 n. 250, 68 n. 259
 Tert. De execrandis gentium diis p. 1175–1177 Oehler 174
 Tert. De idolis 9, 3 174
 Tert. De pallio 3 67 n. 251
 Tert. De spectaculis 6 174
 13 174
 Thallus, FGrHist 256 F 2 137 n. 98
 F 4 a 137 n. 99
 F 4 b 137 n. 99
 F 4 c 137 n. 99
 Theocritus 17, 48 45 n. 124
 17, 121–125 55 n. 179
 17, 123 61 n. 221
 Theodor. Mops. Comment. in Acta ap. 17, 8 ap. Gannat Busamē (versio Anglica) 38 n. 82, 180
 Theodor. Mops. in ep. Pauli ad Tit. 1, 12–13a comment. p 752 Greer 38 n. 82, 180
 Theodoret. Cyr. Graec. affect. cur. II 97 175
 II 112 6 n. 34, 10 n. 87, 149 n. 187
 III 4 6 n. 34, 10 n. 87, 149 n. 187
 III 25 139 n. 111
 III 25–30 175
 III 26–30 170
 Theodoret. Cyr. Interpr. ep. Pauli ad Tit. 1, 12 (PG 82, 861 B) 38 n. 82, 180

- Theognis, *El.* 339 42 n. 111
 Theon Smyrn. *Expos. rer. math.* p. 105
 Hiller 95 n. 50
 Theoph. *Ad Autol.* I 9 151 n. 206, 173
 I 10, 4 38 n. 82, 179
 II 3, 8 38 n. 82, 179
 II 31, 6 157 n. 242
 III 2, 4 93 n. 42
 III 7, 6 10 n. 57, 149 n. 183
 III 29 137 n. 98
 Theophr. *De lapid.* IV 25 93 n. 42
 Theophr. *De piet.* T 584 A Fortenbaugh et
 al. = fr. 13 Pötscher 23 n. 60
 Theophr. *Hist. pl.* III 18, 3 72 n. 4
 IV 4, 14 71 n. 3
 IX 4, 1–2 71 n. 3
 IX 4, 10 71 n. 3
 Theopomp. *FGrHist* 115 F 75 c 20 n. 42
 Theos. *Tubing.* 69 151 n. 208
 Thucyd. III 104 71 n. 1
 Tibullus, *El.* II 5, 9 118 n. 51
 Ps.-Tibullus, *El.* III 2, 23 121 n. 74
 Timaeus, *FGrHist* 566 F 13 ab 85 n. 82
 F 155 57 n. 197
 Tod, *GHI* 191, 5–6 53 n. 174
 Val. Flacc. *Argon.* VI 119 121 n. 74
 Val. Max. *Facta et dicta memor.* I 3, 3 23
 n. 60
 VII 2 ext. 13 57 n. 197
 VIII 15, 1 110 n. 6
 VIII 15 ext. 3 88 n. 11
 Varro, *Ant. rer. div. fr.* 6 a Cardauns 129
 n. 47
 fr. 6 b 129 n. 47
 fr. 32 131 n. 56, 167, 171
 Varro, *Curio fr.* V Cardauns 167, 171
 Varro, *De litoralibus* 38 n. 81, 39 n. 92, 179
 Varro, *Res rust.* I 48, 2 119 n. 57
 Verg. *Aen.* VI 792 sqq. 141 n. 126
 VII 45 sqq. 141 n. 126
 VIII 314 sqq. 141 n. 126
 VIII 319 sqq. 118 n. 51
 Verg. *Ecl.* 1, 6–7 41 n. 107
 Verg. *Georg.* II 139 121 n. 74
 IV 379 121 n. 74
 Ps.-Verg. *Culex* 87 121 n. 74
 Vetus Testamentum
 Exod. 15, 27 158 n. 252
 Gen. 34 156
 Num. 9–10 158 n. 252
 Sap. Sal. 14, 12–21 158, 171
 Xen. *Anab.* I 5, 8 76 n. 29
 V 4, 26 76 n. 32
 Xen. *Hellen.* II 3, 6–7 49 n. 145
 IV 2, 16 87 n. 1
 VI 5, 2 87 n. 1
 VII 1, 26 87 n. 1
 Xen. *Symp.* VIII 9 23 n. 66
 Xenoph. *DK* 21 A 13 151 n. 208